

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, September 30, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 29 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Elvin Selbert, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Luther M. Swygert, of Indiana, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Indiana, vice Hon. Thomas W. Slick, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Jack R. Caulfield, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon, vice Steve Franklin Hamm, deceased.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Edwin C. Kelton, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as president and member of the California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Brig. Gen. Warren T. Hannum, to be relieved.

Col. Rufus W. Putnam, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission, provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. Clay Anderson, Corps of Engineers, to be relieved.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, September 29 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Harry E. Pratt to be United States district judge for division No. 4, District of Alaska.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Ellen K. Raedy to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Charles E. Cassidy to be third judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Leslie E. Given to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia.

John J. Boyle to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

Frank E. Flynn to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

James H. Patterson to be United States marshal for division No. 3, district of Alaska.

J. Henry Goguen to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts.

John J. Farrell to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota.

CHIEF, BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Admiral DeWitt C. Ramsey to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be vice admirals

Arthur B. Cook
John S. McCain

To be rear admirals

Edward W. Hanson	Robert B. Carney
Ernest G. Small	Arthur W. Radford
Thomas L. Gatch	Van Hubert Ragsdale
Ralph O. Davis	John Wilkes
Lloyd J. Wiltse	George F. Hussey, Jr.
Henry M. Mullinnix	

To be commodore

Samuel A. Clement

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

(The nominations of Jack G. Campbell et al., for appointment or promotion in the regular service of the Navy, were confirmed today. A complete list of the persons whose nominations for appointment or promotion in the regular service were confirmed today, may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 21, 1943, beginning with the name of Jack G. Campbell on p. 7700 and ending with the name of John E. Rutherford on p. 7702.)

IN THE MARINE CORPS

FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be lieutenant general

Alexander A. Vandegrift

To be major generals

Keller E. Rockey
Allen H. Turnage

To be brigadier generals

Earl C. Long	Oscar R. Cauldwell
Pedro A. del Valle	Alfred H. Noble

FOR REGULAR SERVICE

To be major

Lester S. Hamel

To be first lieutenant

Peter D. Lambrecht

To be second lieutenants

Frederick M. Rauschenbach	Joe B. Griffiths, Jr.
George C. Axtell, Jr.	Robert V. Perkins
Raymond G. Tomes	James P. Prowell
George B. Woodbury	Robert L. Scott, Jr.
Samuel L. Grigsby	Stephen D. Ryan, Jr.
Frank M. Platt, Jr.	Harry Wollin
Howard G. Gunter	Paul J. Brown, Jr.
John F. Skorich	Irvin J. Gershen
James R. Galbreath	James F. Hovey
	William S. Brewer

Harris H. Barnes, Jr.
Archie B. Norford
Thomas M. Brown
Robert J. McKirnan
Philip T. Kujovsky
James L. Cullen
Richard H. Jeschke, Jr.
John E. Shepherd, Jr.
James T. Pearce
LeRoy Bald
William L. Dick
Eugene C. Swift
Serge S. Gorny
Robert S. Stubbs 2d
James K. Roberts
John P. Sawyer 2d
Harry B. Persinger, Jr.
Robert D. Thurston
James B. Ord, Jr.
Louis G. Nickell 3d

Richard F. Ladd
George F. Lewis
Herbert E. Roser
Wilford L. Stone
Frank H. Griffin, Jr.
John B. Green
Maurice S. Dampier
Eugene J. Adams
Bidwell C. McClelland, Jr.
Benjamin W. Dulany
Frederick Knoth, Jr.
Benjamin H. Sweney
Alexander Kositch
Warren A. Butcher
Donald R. Hall
Odia "E" Howe, Jr.
Paul M. Hupf
Robert A. Heath
Hugh C. Kiger
James P. Jacobson

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in this testing day 'stablish Thou our hearts as we battle not in enmity against men, but against the evil which enslaves and degrades them. Remember our sons and daughters in their perils on land and sea and in the air. Keep love's banners floating o'er them; smite death's threatening wave before them. Give them and us the calm assurance that those who are absent from each other are still present with Thee. Deliver them from temptation. In lonely hours grant them strength and courage for the ordeal which has separated them from the shrines of their love. Comfort them and us by the steadfast faith that they cannot be where Thou art not, on any sea or shore.

O Thou great Shepherd of our souls, when on some far field looking up at the silent stars there seems nothing left but God and prayer, may a familiar voice out of the unseen whisper to their listening hearts the deathless song in the night: I shall not want. E'en though I walk through the valley of the shadow I will fear no evil. Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me. Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of my enemies. If it be Thy gracious will, bring them in safety back to the loved homes they defend and to loyal hearts that hold them dear. Bring us all to the homeland of Thy eternal love and in peace to gates ajar in our Father's fair abode. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, September 29, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on September 29, 1943, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 787. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs;

S. 789. An act to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax-exempt properties in the District of Columbia;

S. 824. An act for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin; and

S. 1223. An act to fix the compensation of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gurney	Reed
Austin	Hatch	Revercomb
Bailey	Hawkes	Reynolds
Ball	Hayden	Robertson
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Barkley	Holman	Scruggs
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	Wheeler
Downey	Moore	Wherry
Eastland	Murdoch	White
Ellender	Murray	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	
Green	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EMPLOYMENT OF ENGINEERS AND ECONOMISTS ON RECLAMATION WORK

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of his determinations during the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944 as to the numbers of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the executive departments and agencies (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Civil Service; and also

Letters from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency and the Senior Deputy Administrator, Office of Lend-Lease Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the Public Health Service for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, and the Lend-Lease Administration for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

SUSPENSION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR—PETITIONS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference various petitions signed by sundry citizens of Canton, Thomaston, Auburn, Kennebunk, Kennebunk Port, West Paris, and other communities all in the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of pending legislation to bring about suspension and prohibition of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the war and the sale of liquor to our servicemen.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petitions presented by the Senator from Maine will be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF ROTARY CLUB OF PROVIDENCE, R. I.—INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Mr. GREEN presented a resolution by the board of directors of the Rotary Club of Providence, R. I., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the cooperation of the United States is essential to the establishment of conditions of a peace which will be fair, just, and lasting; and

Whereas it is a constitutional obligation of the United States Senate to advise the administration with respect to international understandings or treaties; and

Whereas the absence of any prior advice from the Senate as to its attitude toward international cooperation results in uncertainties which are inimical to the development of international cooperation; and

Whereas if we fail to establish the basis for international order and justice as we failed after the last war, we may again be faced with the necessity of making the same terrible sacrifices which are now being made by our armed services and by all of our citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Rotary Club of the City of Providence, R. I., That (1) a clarification and statement by the Congress of the United States expressing its sentiments with respect to international cooperation should be the first order of business of Congress; (2) that this should involve a commitment of future international cooperation, and indicate that we do not favor a policy of returning to isolation; and (3) that Senate Resolution 114, now pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, represents a reasonable statement, and that it, or some similar resolution, should be acted upon promptly by the United States Senate.

ACTIVITIES OF BUREAUCRATS—LETTER FROM H. V. MERING, OF GREAT BEND, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a short letter I have received from H. V. Mering, a leading businessman of Great Bend, Kans., protesting against the bureaucrats and inspectors who, he says, are a great hindrance to the war effort.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERING & SON,
Great Bend, Kans., September 10, 1943.
Hon. Senator CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We have been in business here in Great Bend for the past 35 years. We were one of the first oil jobbers in the State of Kansas and in the last 15 years we have added tires and tire recapping to our business.

As a businessman representing this farmers' community, I feel that this bureaucratic set-up in Washington having bureaucrats, such as inspectors, etc., running around our State harassing businessmen and farmers is a great hindrance to our war effort. Besides, these businessmen and farmers are getting very tired of this.

We are asking you that when these bureaucrats ask for the next appropriation, to use your support and influence in seeing that it is cut in about half. We feel sure that this would help do away with these inspectors who are harassing the good people in our State who are trying to help win this war. Also with this cut in appropriation to these bureaucrats it will save the taxpayers a lot of money which they could use to buy bonds, and thus having the money go where it is justly deserved.

Thanking you for your loyal support in this matter, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

H. V. MERING.

RESOLUTION OF YAVAPAI COUNTY COUNCIL ARIZONA SMALL MINE OPERATORS, ASSOCIATION—PRODUCTION OF CRITICAL MINERALS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the Yavapai County Council, Arizona Small Mine Operators Association, adopted at a regular monthly meeting held at Prescott, Ariz.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas this association is devoted to the furtherance of the interest of all small mine operators, and this council of the association is bending its every effort toward the betterment of the condition of small mine operators, particularly as regards the simplification of the methods of procedure in obtaining loans of Federal funds to be used in development and production of strategic minerals and the obtaining of premium prices for such minerals; and

Whereas it appears that small-mine operators are greatly and unduly handicapped in both these particulars and the contribution to the war effort which small mine operators are prepared and anxious to make is to that extent retarded; and

Whereas it appears wholly unnecessary that long periods of delay should be experienced in action on applications for loans and in the payment of premium prices for strategic minerals already produced and marketed; and

Whereas notwithstanding the great contribution which small mine operators are prepared to make to the war effort at large it appears there is a movement under way to close down all small mines under the mistaken belief that labor will thereby be diverted to the so-called large mines and producers of strategic minerals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Yavapai County Council, Arizona Small Mine Operators Association, does hereby go on record as opposing and deeply deploring all thought and effort toward closing any mine, however small, engaged or capable of engaging in the production of minerals critically needed in the prosecution of the war effort, and we do brand as fallacious and pure sophistry the notion that much-needed labor will thereby gravitate to the larger metal mines. In this connection we call attention to the fact that such has not been the experience as a result of the order closing down gold mines, and such a result cannot rationally be expected if small mines producing the baser metals are ordered closed.

Further resolved, That the best interests of the United States and the most efficient prosecution of the war effort requires and demands that methods of acting on applications for mineral loans be liberalized and simplified, to the end that small miners may be enabled to get into production with a minimum of that which has for so long and so aptly been called "red tape," and so to contribute their full share to the preservation of democracy, as we know it, and the spirit of free enterprise which has made this country great and its peoples truly free.

Further resolved, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, War Production Board, War Manpower Commission, Office of Price Administration, Premium and Quota Committee of the Metals Reserve Company, and other Government agencies be called upon to take notice of the great utility of the small-mine operator in the furtherance of the war effort and urged to take all measures designed to facilitate the granting of loans, the availability of needed materials, the noninterference with local labor, and accelerate the payment of premium prices, and to do all else which may be conducive to mineral production by the small miner at a reasonable margin of profit.

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR TRANSIENT SERVICEMEN IN WASHINGTON

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to read at this time a letter I have just received which speaks for itself. It is as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
WASHINGTON, September 29, 1943.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Since I share your concern over the immediate lack of adequate accommodations for transient servicemen in the Union Station area, I believe you will be glad to know that the Federal Works Agency is well on its way to correct the conditions which you recently brought to the attention of the Congress.

We became aware some time ago that sleeping and other facilities were urgently needed for servicemen in Union Station, some of whom were sleeping on benches, in telephone booths, and in some instances even on the floor of the station. Believing that immediate action was imperative, we acquired the Capitol Park Hotel, directly across Union Station Plaza, for conversion into a sleeping and napping center, equipped with restaurant, canteen, lounge, showers, and other conveniences and necessities. It is to be operated by Recreation Service, Inc., operating unit of the War Hospitality Committee of the District of Columbia. All possible comforts and conveniences are provided, among them arrangements to call sleeping servicemen so they may be on time for their trains.

I have issued orders that the converted hotel must be ready for occupancy by servicemen before the end of October. To this end I have authorized double work shifts wherever sufficient workmen can be obtained. This facility will take care of the transient hotel requirements of 400 to 500 service people.

The course of action we have followed commended itself as the quickest and most effective way of dealing with the situation which you and I alike deplore.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Major General,
United States Army, Administrator.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1315. A bill providing for the transfer to the custody and control of the Secretary of the Navy of certain lands comprising a portion of Croatan National Forest in the State of North Carolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 422);

S. 1336. A bill to authorize the transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 423);

S. 1349. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York; without amendment (Rept. No. 424); and

S. 1351. A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1908, as amended, authorizing settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 425).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1399. A bill for the relief of Frank Knowles; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1400. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Wilder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1401. A bill for the relief of Leo Patrick Frawley; and

S. 1402. A bill to authorize the removal of Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve officers from the honorary retired list under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 1403. A bill for the relief of the surviving dependents of Richard O. Hunnam; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. ANDREWS also introduced Senate bill 1404, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 1405. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kenney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 1406. A bill for the relief of the Contracting & Sales Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

REPEAL OF CHINESE EXCLUSION ACTS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a bill to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes. I have discussed this matter with Congressman MAGNUSON, of the State of Washington, who introduced H. R. 3070 on June 29, 1943, which is pending before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. My bill is a companion bill.

I have gone over the provisions of the bill carefully. It will be observed that section 1 would repeal all existing statutory provisions excluding persons of the Chinese race from entry into the United States. Section 2 would apply the immigration quota provisions to Chinese and would allocate all Chinese persons entering the United States as immigrants to the quota for China. Section 3 would extend the existing naturalization laws to include Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent.

The fact is that no useful purpose is now being served by retaining these exclusion laws in effect since under the quota provisions the Chinese quota would be only 105 persons annually.

The heroic accomplishments of the Chinese people as one of the United Nations in the present global war against totalitarianism make it very appropriate that China should be treated on a par with other countries. The United States has already entered on this policy by voluntarily relinquishing extraterritorial jurisdiction over Americans in China and abolishing the United States Court for China which for many years exercised jurisdiction over such cases.

The maximum immigration permissible under the existing quota laws for all nations is 153,774 persons annually. Whether the existing quotas should be increased or decreased involves a profoundly important question of policy which should not be covered by a bill dealing with the particular problem involved in repealing the Chinese exclusion acts, as is proposed in this measure.

As a member of the Senate Immigration Committee, it is my purpose to try to get a favorable report on this bill as early as possible.

I dedicate my efforts in this matter personally to the First Lady of China, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, and her heroic husband, recently made President of

China. In an effort to aid in a continued friendship which I trust will be everlasting.

As a part of my remarks I desire to have inserted at this point a splendid editorial entitled "America, Asia, and the Future," which appears in the October 9 issue of Collier's magazine.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1404) to repeal the Chinese exclusion acts, to establish quotas, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration; and the editorial presented by Mr. ANDREWS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Collier's of October 9, 1943]

AMERICA, ASIA, AND THE FUTURE

In 1882, American railroad builders had for some years been importing Chinese coolies in unrestricted numbers to help forge the rail network which now, along with our roads, waterways, and air lines, holds this Nation together.

The Chinese could and would work harder for longer hours and for less money than American laborers could or would. American living standards in the west were already threatened, and in time a Chinese tide might have engulfed the country.

In 1882, therefore, Congress enacted the first Chinese Exclusion Act, forbidding Chinese labor to immigrate to the United States.

A similar Japanese threat blew up a little later. President Theodore Roosevelt negotiated the so-called gentleman's agreement with Japan, for strict limits on this immigration without an actual law, in 1907. That lasted till 1924, in which year Congress, over the protests of President Coolidge and various Cabinet members, added a prohibition of Japanese immigration to the Chinese Exclusion Act. The only exceptions are doctors, ministers, teachers, and students.

That, in brief, is the historical background of the current agitation for repeal of the act as regards the Chinese. The Chinese are now our allies in World War No. 2—and extremely valuable allies.

Against the proposed Chinese exclusion repealer are the same old facts and the same old (but now, as we shall see, shrunken) threat: That the Chinese workingman can outswear and undereat the American; and that, therefore, unrestricted Chinese immigration to this country might some day eat away the entire structure of high living standards, high pay, and short workweeks which American labor has struggled to build during the last 50 years.

We can see no use in minimizing these facts and this threat, or in ridiculing the numerous and influential people who still take them seriously. New facts, however, have come into the picture; and these new facts are flanked by some appetizing post-war possibilities.

One of these new facts, of course, is that the Chinese are our allies in this fierce war. Another is that their present-day leaders bitterly resent the Chinese Exclusion Act as an insult to China.

How bitter that resentment is may be gleaned from a glance through Dr. Lin Yutang's latest book, *Between Tears and Laughter* (John Day Co., New York, 1943, 216 pages, \$2.50).

Through Asia, indeed, is spreading a revulsion against the once accepted idea of the military and commercial supremacy of west over east. Fewer and fewer Orientals have any respect for the proposition that a Britisher, American, Dutchman, Frenchman, German, or Portuguese has a divine right to stake out a claim wherever he pleases in the Orient and exploit the natives. The leaders

of China appear to be fully as determined as the leaders of Japan to have no more of this after the present war.

Another fact in this connection is that repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act, as planned by the advocates of its repeal, would not abolish immigration bars as to the Chinese. It would merely put them on the same quota footing as British, French, and so forth, now are. Mathematically, it would work out to admission of 105 Chinese immigrants a year—which can hardly be called an Oriental flood.

As to the appetizing post-war possibilities: they are connected with the fact that China has about 450,000,000 people, that it is very sketchily industrialized as yet, and that its leaders are determined that it shall become highly industrialized. It is estimated that China needs at least 60,000 miles of railroads as a transport foundation for an industrialized China. It has very few of those miles now. After an Allied victory in the war, China will be wanting to build and equip those railroads, at an estimated cost of \$50,000 a mile.

In the United States when Pearl Harbor "whooshed" down upon us, there was one car for every 5 inhabitants, so that it was often boasted that we could all go for a ride at once. In China there is one car for every 5,000 persons. We have one telephone for every nine persons; China has one for every 1,500.

These are only the highlights of the opportunities which post-war China should offer to business emissaries from countries which treated China with reasonable respect and good will during the war. If we can do anything now to line up a fair share of that business for Americans, the post-war benefits to us all should be—well, considerable, at the least, and phenomenal if we get some good breaks.

That is the cold, commercial, materialistic aspect of the matter. There is another aspect. It is bound up with this new rise of self-respect and self-esteem all over the Orient. The Japanese are trying to capitalize on that development to gain their own aim of rulership over, first, the East and, later on, the world.

We can ride with this tide. Thereby, we have a chance to benefit both West and East. Or we can buck this tide—whereby we may set in motion forces which will culminate in World War No. 3.

An honest repealer of the Chinese Exclusion Act—meaning simply the placing of the Chinese on the same restricted quota basis as other races—looks like one safe and inexpensive move toward riding this new tide in world affairs.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by me to the pending bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio will be received, lie on the table, and be printed.

FOREIGN WAR RELIEF OPERATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 99)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on July 7 the President transmitted by message to the Senate a report from the American Red Cross relative to obligations under the appropriations for foreign war relief consolidated and extended by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of

1942, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I now ask that this message and report be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON PLANNING FOR OUR RETURNING SOLDIER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Let's Plan Now for Our Returning Soldier," delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah on September 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BOOK, "CHRISTIAN BASES OF WORLD ORDER," BY THE VICE PRESIDENT—REVIEW BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a review by him of the book entitled "Christian Bases of World Order," written by the Vice President, which appears in the Appendix.]

PLEA FOR STOPPAGE OF SUBVERSIVE PRACTICES RETARDING THE WAR EFFORT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLMAN

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared by him to be broadcast relating to the stoppage of subversive practices which are retarding the war effort, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him on post-war planning, delivered at the New York Times Forum on post-war foreign policy, in Times Hall, New York, September 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

GALLUP POLL ON INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Gallup poll on the question of an international police force, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE PRESIDENT AND HIS ADMINISTRATION

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an advertisement from the Washington Times-Herald of September 26, 1943, paying tribute to the President and his administration, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHORTAGES IN NATIONAL MILK SUPPLY

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation in opposition to subsidies and calling attention to impending shortages in the national milk supply, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW 1-CENT PIECE—LETTER FROM THE DIRECTOR OF THE MINT

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated August 9, 1943, addressed to him by Mrs. Nellie Tayloe Ross, Director of the Mint, in relation to the new 1-cent piece, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXPERIMENT IN WORLD FREEDOM—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO TIMES

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Experiment in World Freedom," published in the September 26, 1943, issue of the

Chicago Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

MANPOWER—STATEMENT BY JAMES P. MITCHELL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on "Manpower," delivered by James P. Mitchell, Director of Industrial Personnel Division, A. S. F., on September 28, 1943, and a statement of Mr. Mitchell's background, which appear in the Appendix.]

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

[Mr. DOWNEY resumed the speech begun by him yesterday. After having spoken for about 1 hour and 10 minutes, he said:]

Mr. President, at this point in my address I desire to say that it will be my purpose to ask first to submit to the Senate a resolution, and to ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I hope the leaders on both sides will consent to the adoption of the resolution, but I should not like to present it and to proceed with respect to it in the absence of distinguished Senators who are not now present, so if any Senator wishes to suggest the absence of a quorum the suggestion will be gratefully received by me.

Thereupon, the following occurred:

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is the purpose of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to ask the Senator from California to yield so he may make a statement at this time. Does the Senator from California yield for that purpose? If so, I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not desire to yield the floor, I will say to the distinguished minority leader. I shall be very happy to have a quorum call and then to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who has a most important and interesting message for us all, if it may be understood that after the Senator from Massachusetts shall have completed his address I may then complete my address.

Mr. McNARY. That is very satisfactory.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much what the Senator from California has said.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Brooks	Clark, Mo.
Andrews	Buck	Connally
Austin	Bushfield	Danaher
Bailey	Butler	Davis
Ball	Byrd	Downey
Barbour	Capper	Eastland
Barkley	Caraway	Ellender
Brewster	Chavez	Ferguson
Bridges	Clark, Idaho	George

Gerry	Maloney	Taft
Green	Maybank	Thomas, Idaho
Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	Moore	Tobey
Hawkes	Murdock	Tunnell
Hayden	Murray	Tydings
Hill	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Holman	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Johnson, Calif.	Overton	Wagner
Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Wallgren
Kilgore	Radcliffe	Walsh
Langer	Reed	Wheeler
Lodge	Revercomb	Wherry
Lucas	Reynolds	White
McCarran	Robertson	Wiley
McClellan	Russell	Willis
McFarland	Scruggam	Wilson
McKellar	Shipstead	
McNary	Stewart	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REPORT ON VISIT TO THE FIGHTING FRONTS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] for yielding to me. As I think he knows, I left Honolulu Tuesday night and arrived in Washington this morning. I believe there is advantage to the Senate in hearing as promptly as possible a report of the kind which I propose to make.

As the Senate knows, I was one of the group of Senators who made a tour of the American war theaters. I shall first sketch the route which was followed, and then present various phases of the war situation. Because of considerations of military security, nine-tenths of the lessons which I learned cannot be discussed in public. I shall gladly talk these matters over with Senators individually, or with the Senate as a whole in executive session, if that should be desired.

I should like to be very careful to state at the outset that a rapid trip around the world does not make a man an expert. I do not pretend to speak as an authority. Luckily for me, I was a working newspaperman for many years, which has given me some training in asking questions, and my military service has given me a wide personal, first-name acquaintance with members of the Army. Being a Member of the Senate, of course, I had access to all the higher military leaders; and being a civilian and a public servant, I had access to the enlisted personnel on a more intimate and franker footing than an officer would usually have. I speak to the Senate today, therefore, as a reporter.

Upon my appointment as a member of the Senate group I decided to address myself primarily to the following matters:

First. The welfare of the troops, involving not only their food, clothing, equipment, medical care, and dependency allotments, but also the leadership which they were receiving, and, if possible, the fighting qualities which they displayed in combat and the obstacles which they had to overcome.

Second. The broad strategic problems in the various theaters, as they affect the conduct of the war and particularly as they point the way toward the problems which will face us after the war.

Third. Wherever time permitted, to look into the work of our civilian agencies abroad. I should say that this lat-

ter phase was especially and thoroughly studied by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who are members of the Truman committee, and I believe they have a report in preparation which will be of the most intense interest and value to the Senate.

It became evident to me that knowledge can be obtained from talking with the men on the spot which cannot be obtained anywhere else. That is because they are imbued with the problems of the areas in which they are serving to a degree which does not exist even here in the Capital. Those men are making life-and-death decisions, and consequently the area in which they live and the significance of it to them is something very real. I should say, of course, that no thorough survey was possible in the time available; and, of course, much time was consumed in transit. But I hope that one good result which may flow from this tour will be the many leads and suggestions which became apparent, and which might well be followed up by committees of the Senate.

In many places I made what is known as a "spot" check regarding the food, post-exchange, and recreation facilities of the soldiers. I shall not burden the Senate with such details, important as they are to the individual concerned, but I have put this specific information at the disposal of the War Department, and I am advised that it will receive prompt attention.

All of us made visits to hospitals wherever it was possible to do so. In the course of the trip almost 2,000 soldiers, I think from every State in the Union, requested me, as they did other Senators, to write to their families and tell them that they were well.

Now for the route itself.

We left Washington on July 25, and went to the United Kingdom via the northern route. While military secrecy prevents me from giving the names of any of the places, I feel that the importance of this north country should be emphasized. It is, for example, possible for relatively small planes to cross the ocean by going from Maine to Newfoundland to Labrador to the west coast of Greenland, then to the east coast of Greenland, to Iceland, and to Scotland. The limiting factor is the weather, which is bad in the winter. This route is, of course, most advantageous to those who want to cross oceans, and disadvantageous to those who want to prevent such crossings.

Newfoundland is an area of especial significance to the North American Continent. When we left there our pilot said, "We have enough gas to get either to Prestwick in northern Scotland or to Marrakech in northern Morocco." That is approximately correct. They are the same distance.

The mercator projection of the world which most of us learned in school is very misleading as to the position of Newfoundland. Broadly speaking, Newfoundland and Bermuda in the Atlantic are comparable to Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands in the Pacific. Bermuda,

like the Hawaiian Islands, is closer to the American Continent than to any other.

The serious obstacle to flying in this northern country is the fog. Since the destroyer deal was made whereby we acquired a 99-year lease on the naval base of Argentina, fields have been discovered which are free from fog. American dollars have built huge runways in some of these places. It is absolutely indispensable that we have rights of access to those fields after the war.

The feature of the stay in the British Isles was the time spent with the fighting men of the Eighth Air Force and the courteous reception accorded us by British officials, for which I desire at this point to express my appreciation. It was a matter of real satisfaction to see the splendid way in which Lt. Gen. Jacob L. Devers was solving his many problems. He is a man of great energy and determination.

The Eighth Air Force can make the proud statement that never since it began operations has an American plane returned before completing its mission because of any action by the enemy. I wish I could convey something of the atmosphere in which they live. Some of it can be indicated by the notices which are posted in a routine manner on the walls of their buildings. One of these notices read, "Remember, when you bail out, don't give out information."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Are we to understand that the effect of the statement which the Senator has just made is that, so far as his information is concerned, every American plane which had gone upon a mission had accomplished that mission before being destroyed or returning to its base? Is that the effect of the statement?

Mr. LODGE. The effect of it is that no American plane has ever been forced back by enemy action before completing its mission.

Mr. DOWNEY. Does the Senator mean to include in that statement the statement that no American plane has ever been destroyed before completing its mission?

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not include that statement.

Mr. DOWNEY. None has been forced back to the base by enemy action?

Mr. LODGE. None has been forced by enemy action to return to its base.

Due to the generous consideration of the other members of the group, it was my privilege to represent them in Sicily, where fighting was in progress on the north coastal road in the vicinity of Cape Orlando. The American Seventh Army, under the gallant leadership of Lt. Gen. George S. Patton and under the high direction of General Eisenhower, is a most formidable ground striking force. The gains of territory which this army made and the rapidity of their advance, which culminated in their entrance into Messina, constitute a brilliant page in our history. I flew to Palermo in a B-25 and went forward to the vicinity of Cape

Orlando along the northern road by automobile. This road is like a shelf cut out of the steep side of mountains with frequent bridges traversing dried up river beds. All bridges had been blown and the stream beds had been heavily mined. It is at all times in view of the sea, and the country was so rough that it was impossible to travel off the road with any type of vehicle. General Patton did not use any frontal attacks because of the tremendous losses which this tactic entails. Instead, he maintained a constant succession of flank attacks. If he wanted to go around the left flank, he used boats. He made three flank attacks from the sea. If he wanted to go around the right flank, he used mules, which he found in Sicily and on which he mounted American saddles which he had brought with him in November. The German troops were fighting hard, but General Patton never gave them a chance to rest or reorganize and these constant flank attacks proved to be deadly. It was a typical American way of fighting.

The operation was conducted on a large scale and with a momentum and drive which continued to the knock-out. General Patton's naval and air support were effective and complete and in every way cooperative.

Senators will also be interested in the fact that the ground in Sicily was most highly organized. There were mine fields on the beaches, barbed-wire entanglements at all the approaches, and a railroad running around the perimeter of the island, equipped with railroad artillery which could be brought to bear quickly at any point. There were pill-boxes of ferro-concrete construction, with walls and roofs one and a half feet thick, which dominated the defiles and principal crossings in the roads.

It may have taken at least 2 years to build those works, and I do not know how much money was expended in their construction. A determined enemy could have made a prolonged resistance. Yet none of these fortifications were used, except in the German-held northeastern corner of the island.

The explanation of this apparent paradox lies partly in the fact that the Italian troops did not have their heart in the struggle. It is also due to the pace, mass, and momentum of our landing. Due to our excellent amphibious equipment, it was possible to unload steamers at sea and carry the loads directly up to road junctions 8 to 10 miles inland. The steamships were loaded in Africa with 1½-ton loads. When the ships got off the shore these amphibious 2½-ton trucks, pictures of which Senators have undoubtedly seen, came alongside. A whole net full of material would be lowered down into the amphibious truck. The truck would go inland 8 or 10 miles, and there the unloading would begin. The movement from ship to shore approximated a movement from one ground point to another. No time was taken to stop and organize. Our boys plunged right in.

It was my privilege to be with one of our infantry companies early one morn-

ing in a small Sicilian village. The death and destruction which were everywhere close at hand are hard to describe. These men had been days and nights without adequate food or sleep. All of the smells and dirt which set ground fighting apart from air and sea fighting and the most gruesome sights of war were surrounding them. They were dead tired, but there was a grimness and determination about these boys which I cannot forget. One regiment marched 60 miles with full pack in 48 hours. Perhaps that will give some picture of the fortitude and determination of those boys.

The medical service even at these extreme forward points was excellent. Young doctors were at hand to administer opiates to our wounded and 10,000 casualties were evacuated to Africa by air, being ministered to on the way by our gallant flying nurses.

In north Africa I had the pleasure of a visit with Lt. Gen. Carl Spaatz, a sincere and effective leader. I also heard fine reports on the services rendered by Col. Elliott Roosevelt.

Another place of especial interest is Basrah, at the head of the Persian Gulf, where our soldiers are overcoming unbelievable obstacles in moving equipment up into Russia. There was a temperature of 162° in the sun on the day we landed, and of about 115° in the shade. Living conditions are among the worst I have ever seen. Yet the morale of the troops was high and the work was going forward at a tremendous rate under the able leadership of Maj. Gen. Donald H. Connally and his staff, who are typical of the high quality of performance which we have come to expect from our Army engineers.

From Basrah we flew to Karachi in northwestern India, which is a big port for the unloading of American supplies for the China-Burma-India theater which is commanded so faithfully by General Stilwell. Even at that distance there were air-raid shelters and a system for protection against bombing. This was due to the possibility, which at one time had seemed imminent, that the Germans would thrust through Persia and subject western India to bombardment. Karachi may therefore be called the easternmost limit of the German threat. Somewhere in India one passes into the area threatened by the Japanese.

From Karachi we proceeded to northeastern India at the foot of the southern end of the Himalaya Mountain Range. Some day the full story will be written of the many deeds of heroism which have been performed in making the flight over this route which is now the only method of transportation into China. Every drop of gasoline, every bomb, everything which our fighters use, has to be flown up over the hump as it is called, 20,000 feet into the air, requiring the use of oxygen in order that the men in the planes may breathe.

In southwestern China is located the headquarters of Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault, a great flying leader with an uncanny ability to read the Japanese mind. He is one of those unusual men who at

one and the same time are creative and brilliant, yet thorough and sound. The story of what he has accomplished with very limited means will also be told after the war, and should inspire every American who reads about it.

I shall not forget a visit to our most advanced airfield in China and the high spirit and energetic performance of our boys who were way out on the end of a limb, it might be said, if ever anyone was in such a position.

From China we went to southern India, passing through the famine-stricken area of Calcutta, which is indeed a city of abject misery. The human suffering in that city is undoubtedly on a par, if indeed it is not greater than, the sufferings of war. Famine, cholera, and death are omnipresent. From southern India we made the jump to Australia, 3,200 miles in length, which was an adventure for us but a tremendous achievement for our crew. I wish to pay my tribute to them. The crew consisted of Maj. Henry Myers, the captain, a wise, resourceful leader; his capable copilot, Lt. Elmer Smith; the phenomenally accurate navigator, Capt. T. J. Boselli; the radio operator, Sgt. Charles Horton; and the engineer, Sgt. Frederick Winslow. They measured up to the highest standards of the military profession. I also extend my appreciation to Brig. Gen. George Schulgen, and to Brig. Gen. Frederick Rankin, a fine doctor and a delightful traveling companion. My thanks also go to Capt. Stephen Leo, who had charge of the arrangements when the party was on the ground.

I ask Senators to reflect for a moment on the implications of such a flight which was made so easily and so smoothly. Certainly, if it is so simple to make such flights in the year 1943, it should be easier to fly even greater distances in the near future. The situation has implications for the future security of our country which no responsible American can ignore.

Another memorable episode was the visit to Gen. Douglas MacArthur's headquarters whence I was later privileged to visit some of the forward airfields which are being constructed so effectively by the Army engineers under incredibly difficult conditions.

Allow me to describe the way in which warfare of this character is frequently conducted. When an American plane, usually of the type being used by the Allies, attempts to land in regions of this character, and contains small parties of engineers and infantry, it tries to pick out a place which is naturally flat. They try to pick out a place where the grass is fairly dry. It grows 10 feet high in this part of the country, and it is necessary to burn it before they land. They then come in and land in this unimproved place. The engineers get out of the plane, and the infantry deploy in the event there should be any Japanese lurking around. The engineers, with the small tools which they have brought along, carry on the important grading operations and get the rocks and other obstructions out of the way. Another plane comes in and brings a sec-

tion of a bulldozer. Another plane comes in and brings other sections until the bulldozer is complete and ready for operation. Before long the crew is at work and the bombing area is advanced that much farther. In a short time another fighter strip would be in operation against the enemy under the dynamic leadership of Lt. Gen. George Kenney.

Perhaps the most telling statement that can be made about General MacArthur's theater is that, although he was given the mission of holding Japan, he has actually cut off and pushed back the spreading tentacles of Japanese imperialism. This is an indication of what can be expected when the main effort swings to the Pacific. I might give a curbstone opinion and say that I think that effort is going to increase greatly very soon.

Another inspiring leader of men, with a strong fighting heart, is Admiral William H. Halsey. Like General Patton, he goes to the most forward areas, where the enemy positions can be seen with the naked eye. He is utterly indifferent to personal danger. He thinks nothing of racing through a narrow channel in a PT boat between two islands strongly held by the Japanese. He enabled me to get a view of warfare in the Solomon Islands which was entirely beyond anything I had imagined. The dangers and difficulties confronting our boys in those remote islands must be seen in order to be appreciated. Looking at the islands from a plane or from a boat, one is struck by their beauty and their rich green vegetation rising from white coral reefs, set in a clear and brilliantly colored sea.

Some of the islands are fairly flat and some are of volcanic origin. A purple haze rises over them, and in the white coral reefs are lagoons here and there in which the water is as clear as crystal. But when you go ashore and try to walk through that jungle you encounter not only physical problems but psychological dangers which only a strong effort of will can overcome. To fight on the ground in those islands is like trying to fight in a dark room. Thick foliage is always pressing in on you. No one knows where or when the blow is going to fall. There the soldier has not the comfort he usually has of knowing where his support on the right is and where his support on the left is. You can see nothing, and the chance of getting lost is very great. It takes a brave man to fight in such a country, and the foot soldiers who do it are entitled to the same praise which we properly accord to the boys in the ships and the planes and in the tanks, whose exploits are perhaps better known.

The problems of supply in that endless chain of islands are difficult in the extreme. Incessant flights by enemy bombers every night make consecutive sleep impossible. On one island the men of one of the Navy construction battalions were working 14 to 16 hours a day, clearing the jungle, building an airfield, and constructing all the utilities that must go into an air base, but they could never get more than 3 hours sleep a night. I hope everyone appreciates the fine work done by these construction

battalions, who are volunteers, recruited from the skilled trades of the United States, including carpenters, plumbers, electricians, road builders, and steam-shovel operators. They have established a record of which American labor and the whole American people must be forever proud.

I do not know why their work has not been made better known. I saw one flying field 6,000 feet long, 200 feet wide, with a surface as smooth and hard as a billiard table, which had been completed in 10 days. It was comparable to the finest landing strips at the National Airport, although it was built in a jungle, a coconut forest, where the trees had to be pulled up, and on coral rocks which frequently are so hard that it is necessary to use a drill. The boys told me that it had actually taken 9 days, because on the ninth day a plane crash-landed on the field, but the official count is 10 days to prepare and place in operation an airfield such as that.

It was also my privilege to go to sea on one of our PT boats. These boys live a dangerous life, operating at high speed at night in a sea full of reefs. Their self-assurance and competence makes one proud.

Our flyers are doing sensational things. At 3:30 on the morning of my departure from the Solomons, I witnessed one of the most spectacular sights of my life. A Japanese bomber was caught in the beams of five searchlights. He was at 20,000 feet, but stood out clearly against the vast inky blackness of the sky. An American P-38 went after him, firing 20-mm. tracer ammunition, which made a red chain of fire, which struck the Japanese and set his left engine on fire. The American made another pass. This time a huge sheet of flame came from the enemy plane. He remained airborne for 30 seconds and then started to fall. As he went down, the American fired another round of bullets into him, and he crashed to the ground. I learned later this was the third Japanese bomber that particular American boy had shot down during the night. That is the kind of boys we have out there.

I do not want to paint too discouraging a picture of the fighting in this theater. It creates a false impression, I believe, to talk about island-to-island fighting. It is more accurate to think of the war in this area as one which progresses from weak point to weak point, bypassing and containing the areas of enemy strength. Certainly the spirit of our men and the results achieved so far with comparatively slender resources gives ground for tremendous optimism, and for the belief that with increased resources it will be possible to make this bypassing operation on a larger scale and still more effective.

It is also reassuring to observe that our men are well satisfied with the weapons they have received, that the food on the whole is as adequate as the tactical situation permits, and that the higher commanders function effectively. So far as food is concerned, of course, there are always exceptions, and I have told the War Department about the exceptions,

but I think that the food, on the whole, is good. I heard especially enthusiastic comments about the planes and the ordnance with which they were furnished. It is noteworthy that the light tank was employed very effectively on New Georgia, and of course our medium tank was used by the Second Armored Division when it went from the coast of Sicily to Palermo, and made an end run, so to speak, around the Germans in those areas.

So much for the chronological account of my trip. I would now like to mention a number of separate items which came to my attention and which are sufficiently important to justify careful investigation and study by the Congress. This information came to me from American sources which I believe to be reliable. It was obviously impossible to make a detailed survey of any one of these topics. They do, however, provide leads for further study.

First. The question of oil. It is a matter of common knowledge that we are exhausting our own domestic resources and that all of our people, particularly those on the eastern seaboard, are experiencing a shortage of petroleum. Yet the information was repeatedly conveyed to me that the United States with less than 25 percent of the oil resources of the world was furnishing over 60 percent of the oil being used to fight this war.

But in Algeria and Morocco, for instance, there is no system of rationing comparable to ours. There are many cases of civilians in these two areas who have more gasoline than civilians in our Eastern States. All the gasoline is American. I was advised that in the city of Algiers, for instance, civilian vehicles consumed 42,000 barrels a month. Surely the war has progressed far enough to justify our treating these civilians like civilians in other Allied countries. It is also noteworthy that at Abadan at the north end of the Persian Gulf is a vast refinery which produces 100-octane gasoline. Yet, I was told, and we were all told, this vast enterprise is only working at 60 percent of capacity. The layman finds it hard to understand why western Australia should not be supplied from this point instead of depending upon the distant and unfortunately dwindling oil resources of California.

Second. Wherever the opportunity presented itself I inquired into the overseas operations of the Office of War Information. I may say that the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] have devoted even more time to it than have I, and will make a contribution more complete than mine. I mention it only because I think Senators will recall that last June I took the position that we should not reduce the amount of appropriations for the overseas operations of O. W. I. I did so on the ground that psychological warfare is an essential weapon of modern war.

Frankly, I now wonder whether I was right. The overseas operations of O. W. I. can be divided into two categories. The first is psychological warfare

against the enemy which is carried on in close conjunction with Army and Navy Intelligence. I understand that this is being well done and should continue unchanged. The second category consists of propaganda in friendly foreign countries. To my mind this is a very dubious undertaking, which was certainly never contemplated by Congress and for which no clear-cut executive policy exists. I found the men administering this activity to be sincere and honest administrators. But they were necessarily confused. In India, for example, propaganda is made available to the press in order to tell the people of India what the average American is like. That is the purpose of our propaganda. The people of India, of course, are interested in what the American thinks about India. How this type of propaganda contributes to the war effort is somewhat a mystery. In Australia mimeographed material is sent to editors to be used as background. Senators who have been working members of the press appreciate the limitless capacity of the editorial wastebasket for matter of this kind. I was told that in New Caledonia the O. W. I. distributes match boxes with the "four freedoms" printed on them but without any mention of the United States. These few instances speak for themselves. I also ask Senators to reflect on the reaction in these countries when the war comes to an end and these activities suddenly stop.

On the whole the personnel of our civilian agencies seemed to me to be of a high caliber and there was a harmony and teamwork among them which might well be emulated in Washington. I believe that more information would be useful on the Middle East supply center which operates in Cairo and allocates materials as well as export and import licenses for American supplies in that area. It is a joint American-British enterprise and its structure should be better understood at home than it is now.

Third. I was able to see the A. M. G. O. T. in operation in Palermo. Lt. Col. Charles Poletti is coping energetically with the many acute problems. I have here a specimen of the money put out by the A. M. G. O. T. This particular bill is for 500 lira and is supposed to be the equivalent of 5 American dollars. On its face it carries the words "500 lira," but contains no promise of any kind. On its reverse are the "four freedoms," printed in English, although this money circulates among Italians. What the face of this bill promises I do not know. I hope the reverse will not be construed as a promise which the already overburdened American people are neither rich enough or numerous enough to keep.

On so rapid a trip dependable information about foreign opinion is best secured by talking to Americans who have lived in the country a long time. Conversations with these persons lead me to believe that there is very little fear abroad that the United States will not discharge its international obligations or take advantage of its international opportunities. Insofar as foreign opinion about the United States is concerned,

there seem to be two impressions. One is an expectation of gifts and favors from the United States which are far beyond our capacity to confer. The other is a fear, which I think is unreasonable, of the expansion of our foreign trade and of our world-wide aviation. Again, I was impressed with the dangers of overstatement and of making promises which are impossible of fulfillment. I submit once again that a clear, frank statement of national aims, based on national interest and guided by justice, would accomplish more good for the world and would cause less hatred and disillusionment later on.

This brings me to my fourth point. There is much real dissatisfaction among our men abroad with what they conceive to be the censorship and propaganda policy of the Government. What appears to them to be unwillingness to put out information which is not favorable and laudatory is completely out of tune with the realistic attitude which our young men have toward this war. When they come out of a situation in which they have been pushed around a bit, it can be imagined how they feel when they get the reports which make no mention of the possibility of their being normal human beings. Comments which I heard range all the way from criticism of the cigarette advertisements which always portray field soldiers as clean-shaven and neatly pressed, to disagreement with the practice of portraying all our allies as being perfect. Our boys know that we are not perfect; that no one is perfect and that our allies are not perfect either. The good cooperation achieved between the Allies to date can only be evaluated at its true worth if it is realized that there are frequent, and natural, differences of opinion. The dangerous results of sugary and overdrawn propaganda should be apparent to us all. Look back for a moment over some of the hallucinations which have been widespread. Do you remember the generally accepted statement that the French Army was unbeatable? Do you remember the belief that the Russians would collapse in 6 weeks? Do you remember the statements that the Japanese Navy was made of cardboard? We must not perpetrate any more of these false notions. We invite ultimate cynicism, disillusionment, and even hatred of our allies if we do so.

I have seen small signs of this already. Many of our young men, for example, come to China imbued with the idea that China is a great modern democracy with millions of men fighting with their backs to the wall. Upon arrival they find this is not the case. With the impetuosity of youth they thereupon go to the other extreme. They overlook the industry, good humor, and democratic attitude of the individual Chinese once they have discovered that the Central Government is not like ours. They overlook the fact that due to the Chinese Army 15 Japanese divisions are in China, in spite of the fact that the Chinese Army, to put it mildly, is not comparable to ours. They overlook the advantage to America in having a strong China. It would be

better for China and for us if a true picture were given to the American people. When Oliver Cromwell had his portrait painted he said to the artist, "Paint me as I am, the wart and all." The truth about China is in many ways inspiring, and China as she now stands is a real military asset to the United States. Her achievements can be more accurately measured if her difficulties are more clearly realized. It is written that "the truth is mighty and shall prevail." It will prevail in this case. I do not want to see a wave of cynicism and disillusionment following in its train.

Fifth. The question of a post-war military policy will some day be before the Senate and I thought it of great interest to see the lessons which were being learned in the white heat of actual combat experience. The fact which is most striking is the close integration of forces in land, sea, and air. None can exist without the other. At General MacArthur's headquarters, land, sea, and air are separate entities under general headquarters. In Admiral Halsey's theater, Army, Navy, and Marine officers are so intermingled that it is difficult to know to what service a man belongs. One outfit in this theater is commanded by a major general of the Army with a captain in the Navy as chief of staff, and a Marine Corps colonel as operations officer. All three, it should be noted, are flyers. Senior officers of both the Army and the Navy are deeply impressed with the need for unity of the services when our new military policy is framed. There is a surprising amount of sentiment among these older men for a single department of war, with autonomous land, sea, and air services coordinated at the top by a joint staff, with each branch free to pursue its own personnel and matériel policies. There is a strong feeling that it would be unwise to build up a large Reserve Corps in our Air Force because of the necessity of having such a large number of men between the ages of 18 and 25 in this particular arm. It is thought that a college training program which keeps a man in the Air Force until the age of 25 would assure us a steady supply of youthful flyers. There is also much talk about having the same commissioned officers' insignia for all men who fight for the United States.

Sixth. Perhaps one of the most striking physical phenomena to a modern world traveler are the huge airfields which have been constructed with American money and American labor, at the farthest corners of the earth. Most of these have not been constructed in territory belonging to the United States, and military secrecy forbids my stating just where they are. Estimates of the amounts expended on these airfields run as high as \$500,000,000. So far as I could learn we have no post-war rights of access to any of them. We do not seek dominance; we abhor imperialistic domination over native people; all we want is an even break. But in the islands of the Pacific and in other places there are many points which are essential to the military security of our country in this new air age. As we conquer the island possessions of Japan

there will be more. We want no dominance over other peoples or races. The places I have in mind can be secured for us without violation of this principle, because they are all so sparsely populated. I should not say can be secured for us. We will secure them in this war, because that is an American theater. American blood has been shed to get these places. American boys are buried there now. Some of these places must remain in American hands. I devoutly hope for effective international cooperation to keep the peace. I shall do everything I can to that end. We cannot, however, assume that this relieves us of the responsibility of maintaining an adequate, a model, and a forward-looking military establishment.

Seventh. The question of international communications is of the first importance. There are large areas of the world where our British allies have complete control of the cable system. I do not know how many of our higher commanders overseas spoke to me on the need for parity in this matter and suggested that it seems like a fitting subject for reverse lend-lease. I talked with high British officials about it, and was pleased to find that they thought it was definitely a subject for negotiation.

Eighth. I now come to a topic of great delicacy but of such importance to the American people that, having seen some of the sad sights I have seen, I feel I must mention it. I refer to the questions raised by Russia's relation with Japan. Certainly all of us who have admired the courage of the Russian people in fighting a dangerous enemy to the death can understand her unwillingness to open a war on other fronts. Certainly no one is more deeply interested than the parents of our American boys in the success of Russian arms over Germany. But it is also true that the whole character of the Pacific war would change if the United States had access to the Pacific coastal area of Russia. For reasons of security I shall not say how many American lives would be spared if we receive this aid. I can say that it is a major factor in the whole Pacific picture. It is one of the biggest military facts staring us in the face.

Ninth. Wherever we went we found a demand for a definite policy of relieving men overseas after they have served a certain length of time. In some of our smaller islands and in certain Air Force units such a policy exists already. There is no doubt that after a man spends a certain amount of time in an overseas theater his efficiency decreases. Shipping problems and the danger of submarine attack have made it impracticable to send men home. I hope that as the situation improves a dependable policy for the relief of troops overseas can be worked out.

Before I close I wish to pay my tribute to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of our group. He was always considerate and courteous, made a most intelligent contribution to our work, and on many occasions represented the Senate with dignity and force. The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]

worked indefatigably in the performance of his labors for the Truman committee, and was serene, fair, and genial under all circumstances. My colleague of the Military Affairs Committee, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], with his interest in military matters, brought his cheer and personality to American boys in camps and hospitals and made many friends wherever he went. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] expended his apparently inexhaustible energy and used his quick discerning mind to gather information which will be of great value to the Senate. They were all delightful traveling companions and I look back on my fellowship with them with lasting satisfaction.

Mr. President, it is a matter of interest to the Senate, I think, to be told that one of our former Members, Senator Gibson, of Vermont, is a lieutenant colonel in the Army. I saw him in New Georgia. He had been struck in the head by a shell fragment, and if it had gone a little bit farther he would have been killed. As it was he escaped with a scar.

I saw the brother of our friend the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who is in the Army.

I also saw the brother of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

One word with respect to the work which women have done in the war theater. It has a priceless value. The Red Cross workers have done more for the happiness and good spirits of our soldiers than I can describe. They endure the heat and dust of Africa and the cold of Iceland. They work long hours and are always cheerful. The accomplishment of our Army and Navy nurses should always be remembered. They have saved many lives and unselfishly and tirelessly perform their errands of mercy.

I also saw certain colored units which had rendered conspicuously distinguished service. I hope that some time the names of these units will be published.

In a voyage of this rapidity and magnitude, impressions are so numerous and so various that it might seem hard to single out any one impression as the major one. My most lasting impressions were formed in the field and in the hospitals, where I saw the kind of boy America produces.

I think of one boy in Sicily whose back was broken and who had just been placed in a plaster cast which reached up over his chin. Steel clamps were in his skull in order to exert traction on his spinal column. He was destined to lie this way for 6 months and then his recovery was not sure, but when I spoke to that boy he answered me with a joke. I think of another one whose face was horribly burned—there are a great many horrible burns in this gasoline war—whose eyelids had to be lifted up for him by a nurse and who only had a hole for a mouth. But out of that hole came the strong voice of courage.

I think of a Lieutenant Miller, of Alabama, who was washed up on a beach in the South Seas. He felt so weak from the explosion of the ship he had been

on that he could hold nothing in his stomach, and thought he was going to die. So he took off his shoes and gave them and his equipment to brother officers, thinking that they might need them to save their own lives. He lay down on the beach. In the morning he drank some rain water and he found he could hold it in his stomach. He concluded he was not going to die. He stripped a Japanese corpse that was washed up on the beach and, gathering some Japanese hand grenades, made a camp for himself in some thick bushes on the island. When a Japanese party sought him out he destroyed them with the grenades and armed himself with their pistols. After 42 days he was found, but declined to leave the island until his captured Japanese documents, which he felt were necessary for the Naval Intelligence, as well as the weapons, had been safely removed. That is the kind of boy I think of.

I think of Lt. Jack Kennedy, of Massachusetts, son of our former Ambassador to Great Britain, whose PT boat was cut in two by a destroyer, who drifted for 18 hours on the hull, and finally reached a small island. Every night that young man would swim out to the channel, and, supported by his life preserver, would signal with a flashlight all through the night to attract the attention of an American boat. He finally succeeded in doing so; and thus, by means of his brave conduct, the other members of his crew were rescued.

I think of a gunner in a B-24, a boy from Pennsylvania, whom I saw in Port Moresby. His whole right side was a mass of gunshot wounds. He had been wounded at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. I saw him at 10 o'clock the next morning. He had lost his right eye. We know what happens to a man in civilian life who loses an eye. He is seriously weakened, if not prostrated in both mind and spirit. But when I spoke to that boy, his voice came back as strong as mine is now, and he said, "The thing that bothers me is that they probably won't let me fly any more."

I think of Lionel Pelletier, of Fall River, who was a member of the crew of a plane from Iceland which came down in Greenland, and of all the places in the World, Greenland is the most appalling one. He was the only boy in the party who did not drink salt water, and he was the only one who lived. The crew escaped in a rubber boat. Of the eight members of the crew, seven died. He was found with one dead body which he had been too weak to throw overboard. Because of his self-discipline and his self-control, he survived. When I saw him at the hospital he had complete mental and emotional self-control—an astonishing thing, considering what he had gone through.

I think of Bernt Balchen, a great aviator, who went up in a plane and made a search for the crew of another plane which had been forced down on the Greenland ice cap. When he finally located them, they were in a very remote spot, and it was obvious that immediate rescue was necessary if their lives were

to be saved. At that time Bernt Balchen was flying a seaplane. The only place where he could possibly land was in a slight depression in the ice cap where the ice had melted just enough to form a thin film of water. Of course, any aviator would realize that in landing in such a spot the chances were that the plane would crash and possibly the aviator would be killed and, furthermore, even if a successful landing could be made, it was obvious that there was only the slightest chance of being able to take off again from such a small area of melted ice. Nevertheless, without hesitation, he landed his seaplane there, and kept circling it on the surface of the water so that the plane would not stick in the slush ice which lay immediately below the few inches of water. Each time he went past the group of marooned men he reached over the side of his plane and pulled in one of them. Only his extraordinary strength enabled him to perform the feat of pulling into his plane, while it was in motion, men who were so weakened that they could not help themselves. One by one, he pulled all of them into his plane, and, by the exercise of his great skill, was able to lift the plane off the water, and fly the men back to the base.

I think of a party of newspapermen whose plane crashed in Burma, leaving a number of them severely injured, and I think of the Army doctor, Colonel Flickinger, of California, who, with two Medical Corps enlisted men, took off in a plane, flew over the spot where the other plane had crashed, and parachuted down, in order to take care of the men who had been injured.

I could speak of many other instances of similar heroic conduct.

How can one explain such bravery? Those boys do not die with any slogans on their lips, the way the Japs and Nazis do. They are freemen who do not need any infusion of political oratory. They fight and die so superbly for something much deeper than any catchwords. Their courage springs from individual self-respect; and it can occur only in a country where the individual is the master of his Government. It is far more powerful than any urge instilled by propaganda. A country which produces individuals of that type is indeed worthy of a mighty struggle. Today those boys do not take America for granted. When they come home they will have as much civic consciousness as any other group of citizens we have ever had. They will never again be apathetic about their country. War is horrible, but war also brings out heroism and bravery which are magnificent. We can see the justification of the United States in the men it sends into battle. Their conduct is a peremptory command to us to leave no stone unturned in order to be worthy of their sacrifice. [Applause.]

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from

liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I deem it a rare honor that I have had the opportunity to yield the floor to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I have not heard in the Senate any address more inspiring, more important, and more valuable to us than the one which just now was delivered by the Senator from Massachusetts, and I hope we shall have an opportunity in the reasonably near future to hear from the other Senators who were on the same trip.

I have sent to the desk a resolution which I should like to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 182) authorizing the Committees on Naval Affairs and Military Affairs to hold joint hearings with respect to the use and effect of Allied air power against Germany and Japan, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committees on Naval Affairs and Military Affairs are authorized and directed to meet in a joint session or sessions and to hold hearings as quickly as possible to investigate, and to determine and report back to the Senate as rapidly as possible upon, the following questions:

(1) What is the present and potential air-power production of the Allied and Axis Nations?

(2) To what extent does the continued building of a larger land army tend to curtail the production of aircraft and their supplies and auxiliaries?

(3) How much airplane bombing will be required to destroy the cities, railroads, utilities, and production centers of Germany and Japan?

(4) How long would it probably take with whatever bombers are available to force the surrender of Germany?

(5) What will be the effect upon our present and potential injury to Germany by air power if new combat areas are opened and large invasions of Europe are begun by the Allied forces?

(6) What will probably be the Allied casualties if Germany is conquered by air power, and what will probably be the casualties if there is a further invasion of the European continent and the actual destruction of the German Army and fortresses?

The Committees on Naval and Military Affairs of the House of Representatives are hereby invited to attend and participate in such hearings. At the hearings the committees shall call for advice and information from such governmental officials and military experts as they shall deem advisable and shall request the advice and judgment of General Arnold and General Kennedy, if it is possible to have their presence without injury to our war effort; and if they are unable to be present, then the committees shall secure the appearance of such senior air-power officers as may be available. So far as possible the hearings shall be open and only if it clearly appears that the publication of any information would be opposed to public interest shall it be considered confidential.

Upon the passage of this resolution, the bill S. 763 shall be laid aside and shall be made a special order of business for further consideration by the Senate at noon of the second calendar day upon which the Senate is in session after a report has been made pursuant to this resolution. The author of the bill S. 763 shall be invited to attend and participate in any meetings or hearings held pursuant to this resolution.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, it is my intention a little later to request the unanimous consent of the Senate that I may submit the resolution, have it immediately considered, and agreed to by unanimous consent. If that can be accomplished I shall not at this time place in the RECORD the additional material which I think it is necessary to have in order to have an understanding of the problem, but I shall await an opportunity to present the material to the committee which would be formed pursuant to the resolution.

I feel most fortunate in seeing in the Chamber at this time the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs; the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs; our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]; and the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who has been very active as an opponent of the pending bill. I am led to be encouraged, by what the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said last night, to believe that it may be possible to secure unanimous consent for consideration and adoption of the resolution.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938; and

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, yesterday during the course of the debate I placed in the RECORD certain figures showing the comparative productivity of the people of the United States with that of the other Allied Nations and Axis Nations. I showed our war expenditures compared with those of other nations, I showed our increased public debt in proportion to that of other nations. As I stated at that time, I have no desire to criticize or derogate the efforts of any of our allies; I believe that both Britain and Russia are doughty and worthy allies, and I have no criticism of them; but the material I placed in the RECORD was merely in answer to American leaders who repeatedly criticize and derogate the efforts of the Americans themselves. I said that Mr. Mitchell, head of the Labor Division of the War

Department, had made a statement which was grossly inaccurate and unfair, and it was in response to this and many other similar statements, that I was placing the figures in the RECORD.

The quotation is as follows:

James P. Mitchell, director of the Army's industrial personnel division, asserted that a national service law is "badly needed" if labor supply is to match labor demand for war purposes.

"The American people are not mobilized for war," Mitchell said, defending the War Department's persistent advocacy of a compulsory labor draft.

"A far smaller proportion of our population of working age is either at work or in the armed forces than in any other major nation at war. We have hardly touched the vast reserve of potential war workers in non-manufacturing construction, trade, and services, or in agriculture, which has increased its employment."

Mr. President, I categorically say that that statement is inaccurate and incorrect, and I challenge the man who made it to present to the Senate of the United States any specific figure upon which he claims it to have been based.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that every one appreciates the fairness of the able Senator from California in the comment he has made as to the purpose of putting figures in the RECORD showing the amount of our debt, and our expenditures in this war so far as compared to the expenditures, for example, of Britain and Russia. Of course, the Senator with his customary fairness would be one of the first to admit that if we are to establish a balance sheet of total sacrifice in the war it would be impossible to leave out the number of lives our allies have contributed thus far to the common struggle.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for that comment.

I desire to say now that in order to be able to present the material I have and to complete my speech I shall be unwilling to yield any further for comments and questions unless any Senator believes that some statement of fact I am making is incorrect, in which case I shall be anxious to have a rectification made.

I wish to reply to the Senator from Florida in this respect, that there is only one of the Allied Nations that has suffered any considerable loss of men. That is Russia. In my figures I did not compare the productivity of the people of the United States with that of the Russian people, which would manifestly be unfair. No other nation amongst the Allies has suffered any great loss. As a matter of fact 80 to 90 percent of the losses of the Allies have been sustained by the Russian people, and a negligible amount by the Americans and by the British, terrible as those losses are to us and to the homes which have been devastated by the men who have left them forever.

Mr. President, yesterday I argued that we should not draft fathers because there

yet remained a sufficient number of qualified single men available for the proposed increase of our Army who could be taken without injury to our production, and I contended that in no event should we further increase our armed forces under present conditions because there is little reasonable chance we will ever be able to use the major portion of our present land forces; that the continued recruitment for the army tends to take away critically needed material and men from the production of our aircraft; that in our fighters and bombers we have a supremely cheap and supremely effective instrument of war which can force the surrender of Germany with little loss of American life and with no further injury to Europe outside of Germany.

I made the statement that Mr. Churchill recently stated in Parliament that Allied plane superiority over Germany is presently at 4 to 1; that Germany continues to weaken while we grow stronger, and that if such conditions continue they will present the possibility of methodical destruction of every building in Germany by air bombing with small losses to the Allies.

English Air Marshal Bomber Chief Harris was quoted to the effect that sufficient bombing of Germany would take her out of the war within a few months, and yesterday I placed in the RECORD the latest release from Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, showing our huge and accelerated aircraft production, and I then stated that I had secured authoritative confidential governmental data on our fighter and bomber production and that we presently and potentially have ample aircraft for the Japanese war and enough beyond that to assure the destruction or surrender of Germany by concentrated air bombing within less than 6 months. I asserted that, so far as I could ascertain, every air-power expert was in agreement with my opinion that Germany could be fatally stricken within a few months by continued and concentrated air bombing and that a large invasion of Europe was totally unnecessary and unjustified and might waste and sacrifice millions of British and American soldiers with colossal injury and destruction in the European countries in which the land engagements might be fought.

I also referred to a spokesman who explained that his reference to deteriorating German air power applied only to Nazi fighter planes, since the Germans' bombing always was poor, bearing as much relation to proper use of air power as a chariot to a tank. He said the Germans made their major effort in the air over Italy before the Allied invasion, when the Nazis concentrated fighters along the Naples-Foggia line, but our air strength overwhelmed them.

Mr. President, with Nazi air power thus falling, if our bombers are now concentrated over Germany, how long can she resist? We have presently a 4 to 1 superiority, our production is rapidly increasing, the number of Hitler's airplanes is constantly decreasing. Can such a combination of causes result other than

in the quick surrender or destruction of the German Nation? Apparently it cannot if our high command can be brought to see that in our air power we have a supremely effective and supremely cheap instrument of overwhelming force.

Constantly now, over the German people hangs the fear and threat of terrifying, destructive bombing—no comfort, no hope any longer in the blue sky of a summer day or the starry silence of a summer night. Only the dread of fearful sudden death—of mighty monsters roaring overhead.

Hamburg, the second largest city of Germany with a population of over a million—about the size of Detroit—and almost its equal in manufacturing production—lies today a scarred and broken monument to the destructive power of the R. A. F. and American bombers which passed like a cloud of death over her people in four raids between July 24 and August 2, leaving behind them a burning, bleeding wreck of a once mighty city. In her shipyards the *Leviathan* and *Bismarck* had been built. Brahms and the great Jewish composer, Mendelssohn, were born there and it was one of the foremost centers of music, culture, and architecture that the world has known.

A realistic comprehension of the potentialities of aircraft as a weapon of war may be gained by reading an article in the Washington Post of September 20 by Henry B. Jameson, Associated Press staff writer, dated at London, Monday, September 2, headlined "R. A. F. says 77 percent of Hamburg lies in ruins." The article is as follows:

Seventy-seven percent of sprawling Hamburg, formerly Germany's second largest city and chief port, lies in ruins as a grim and smoldering example of what is in store for Berlin and other cities when allied air power cuts loose in its full and awful fury.

The full story of the unprecedented devastation produced in the one-time industrial center by 4 R. A. F. and 2 American Flying Fortress raids between July 24 and August 2 at a cost of 87 bombers was disclosed by an R. A. F. commentator today after weeks of study of photographs and intelligence reports.

They show the once flourishing city of 1,830,000 population has, for the time being at least, almost ceased to exist.

Altogether between 5,000 and 6,000 acres—about 9 square miles—were devastated.

That is nearly 100 times Coventry's similarly damaged area, and nearly 60 times greater than the principal area of devastation in London (105 acres) at the peak of the German aerial attack to knock Britain from the war in 1940.

The "built up" area of Hamburg which was destroyed includes the city proper and its suburbs.

The R. A. F. dropped approximately 7,000 long tons (7,840 United States tons) of bombs on Hamburg, but the additional tonnage dumped by the Fortresses has not been revealed.

In their biggest raid on Coventry 400 German planes dropped 450 tons in 9 hours—a rate of almost a ton per minute.

In the last big raid on Hamburg the R. A. F. dropped 2,350 long tons in 45 minutes—a rate of more than 50 tons per minute, or more than 50 times the intensity of the largest Coventry raid.

The Hamburg photographs reveal an almost uniform expanse of gutted buildings. Fire swept through street after street for miles,

particularly in commercial and port areas, destroying everything.

Light patches measuring up to 125 yards across dot the city, where big block busters leveled even big steel-and-concrete buildings.

The official damage list, which scrupulously includes hospitals, churches, and other institutions which could not escape the holocaust, includes as "almost entirely destroyed" 8 shipbuilding yards, 3 oil works, 6 nonferrous metal works, 20 armament and steel works, 11 chemical works, 8 textile plants, 21 food-stuff plants, 31 miscellaneous factories, 16 gas and electric plants, 14 administrative buildings of a large Army camp, 419 warehouses, the city's main railroad station, and 5 suburban stations.

Mr. President, a spectator horrified at the ruin and wreck of a once great city might well say with William Blake—

I travel'd through a land of men,
A land of men and women, too;
And heard and saw such dreadful things
As cold earth wanderers never knew.

The waste and ruin of one of the Reich's greatest cities was accomplished by a few thousand young men in a few hours of battle. Any allied military commander would have been willing to sacrifice 10 or 20 divisions to raze a port and production center like Hamburg, but in this raid only 87 bombers were lost. Yet, though our military leaders must know that we in the United States have the capacity for producing aircraft beyond that of all the rest of the world combined, we burden our production and waste our manpower in building and maintaining great land forces whose futility will be constantly more apparent as time passes on and airpower steadily accumulates.

The science of aerial warfare is probably still in its pioneering stages. Yet one important principle already has been developed by American flyers. I refer now to our precision bombing by virtue of which in daylight raids we can drop a great weight of bombs onto definite targets. Precision bombing stands in contrast to the R. A. F. saturation or area bombing. German sleep, courage, and morale are now under the strain of raids which extend over both day and night. In the darkness the roar of the R. A. F. is heard and the explosion of bombs devastating impartially great areas of the metropolitan districts. In the light of day, our Liberators and Flying Fortresses rush through the skies, dropping their earth-shaking explosives on submarine yards, railroad centers, factories, dams, bridges, and military installations. Air experts universally accord to complementary day and night attack an effect so destructive and gigantic that no nation can long endure it.

We have considered the case of Hamburg, which crumbled under the combined blows of English and American flyers. Let us look now upon the ruinous effects of American precision bombing as it strikes directly at the production centers, the utilities, and the transportation of an enemy country. The Office of War Information has sent me a description of the results of American precision bombing. I think it will be found interesting and I believe it will

be agreed that no nation long subjected to such bombing can long continue to wage a total war.

Not yet half of the 60 cities of the old Reich with 100,000 and more inhabitants have been bombed severely and only a few were subject to "saturation" raids (like Hamburg and cities in the Ruhr district).

DIRECT RESULTS

Direct results differ according to the type of raid, either daylight precision or night mass bombing.

Examples of daylight precision bombing are the raid of the Moehne Dam on May 17, the attack on the rubber factory of Huels on June 27, and the Ploesti raid of August 1.

The bombing of Huels eliminated a considerable part of Germany's synthetic rubber production. The raid on Ploesti destroyed oil refineries which supplied the German Air Force with large amounts of high-octane gasoline. The bombing of the Moehne Dam had far-reaching effects on the entire area between Essen and Hamm. Blast furnaces in the vicinity of Dortmund were flooded and destroyed, coal dumps were set afire, pit heads blocked, railway tracks carried away, tunnels obstructed, and highways destroyed. The consequences for the water economy of the whole area will be felt for months: Water regulation on rivers and canals as well as water supply for industry and homes are badly disorganized.

The consequences of night mass bombings are more widely felt. It is the concentration of raids on a particular area which creates most havoc. Each additional raid adds to the disorganization of air-raid protection, repair, and salvage work.

The Ruhr district presents an ideal target for this type of bombing. There, over two-thirds of Germany's total output of certain basic materials are produced (67 percent of hard coal, 80 percent of coke, 60 percent of pig iron, 59 percent of steel ingots and castings, 60 percent of special steels).

No detailed reports on the amount of damage done to this area are, of course, available. According to reliable sources the steel output of the Ruhr at the end of May was only 65 percent of the scheduled output.

INDIRECT RESULTS

Even more important than the direct results are the indirect consequences of bombing. They affect almost every way of German life.

Most obvious is the diversion of German military strength: hundreds of fighter planes, thousands of anti-aircraft guns, hundreds of thousands of soldiers must be kept in the Reich for air-raid defense. Such diversion is of great help to the Russians and in the Mediterranean area.

No less spectacular are the consequences in the economic field. Bombing is internal blockade with all its far-reaching effects.

The lack of manpower, Germany's most serious deficiency, is severely aggravated. Hundreds of thousands are kept busy with A. R. P. services, salvage, and repair work. In addition, the nervous strain caused by repeated bombing greatly affects the working efficiency of workers and employees.

Another consequence of mass raids is economic and administrative disorganization. Germany's total war economy is so highly complicated that obstruction of one part results in frictions on the whole. Mass raids like those on the Ruhr and Hamburg districts impair the entire system of civilian supplies and services resulting in disorganization of rationing, serious break-downs in all public services, destruction of records and documents in public and private offices, as well as disrupting the monetary system of the country (more cash is needed, less taxes are paid).

Evacuation and evacuees spread these difficulties over the whole of the Reich. Exact figures of the total number of evacuees are unavailable. Estimates oscillate between 1,250,000 and 4,000,000. Housing and food problems in evacuation areas are aggravated by the wild flight of people trying to escape from air danger, government controls, and regimentation of evacuees. Where to send these millions becomes more and more difficult. Recently evacuees were sent into Polish areas and temporarily housed in camps formerly occupied by Jews. Our advance into Italy will more and more restrict areas in Germany which can be considered safe.

EFFECTS ON MORALE

Last but not least the effects of bombing on general morale do not concern only the bombed areas, but also the threatened districts. Sometimes the fear of bombing is worse than the bombing itself. In addition, there are indirect results of bombing which are often overlooked. Bombing affects not only the morale of the home front, but also that of the fighting fronts. The German soldier no longer can maintain the illusion that by his fighting he can protect his home. The German industrialist may escape bombings, but must worry constantly that his capital assets may be destroyed at any time. Thus, for the first time, the German industrialists feel the horrors of war.

Evacuation from bombed districts into Austria has done much to alienate Austrians and Germans.

The Germans know well that they now receive what they gave to the British. There is a word going around in Germany: "Hitler has started the total war, but the Allies carry it out."

Mr. President, one of the latest articles considering the possibility of defeating Germany by air power alone is in the Reader's Digest for October, written by Francis Vivian Drake, a veteran fighter pilot of World War No. 1, authoritative spokesman for air power in World War No. 2, author of *The Air Plan and Vertical Warfare*. This short article which I am about to read is entitled "Smash the Luftwaffe and End the War":

[From the Reader's Digest]

SMASH THE LUFTWAFFE AND END THE WAR!

(By Francis Vivian Drake)

The Nazis' loss of fighter planes on all fronts has lately been averaging a minimum of 700 and 800 per month which is roughly equal to their rate of fighter production. If this loss rate remains constant, the Luftwaffe will be breaking even. If, on the other hand, the Allies should step up their air offensive to a point where they were destroying 1,200 or more of the German fighters monthly, the Luftwaffe would literally sink out of sight within 90 days for lack of planes and pilots.

With the Luftwaffe annihilated Germany would be deprived of any practical means of preventing every city in the Reich from suffering the fate of Hamburg.

I should like to say to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that many of these heroic young men who are now saving the world come from the great State of Texas. I am not surprised. Texas has always produced virile men. She has produced great football teams. She has produced magnificent fliers, almost unrivaled in the world. The fliers from the southern part of the United States are of extraordinary efficiency and valor. Let me say to the Senator that I am reading an article by one of the great

air experts of the world. His statements are consistent with those of every other expert. He says that within 90 days these gallant, heroic men could end the whole titanic conflict with the loss of a few thousand lives, saving millions of casualties.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for his generous comment with respect to the young men from my State. Without making any invidious comparisons, I may suggest at this time that both before the actual outbreak of the war, while we were in preparation for it, and since the war began, there has been a greater percentage of men from Texas in the armed forces than from any other State in the Union.

Speaking of aircraft, and the training of men for the air service, I wish to suggest to the Senator from California that in Texas we have greater aviation training facilities for the Navy than are located in any other part of the world, and that each year the magnificent training institution at Corpus Christi, Tex., is training thousands of capable fliers. The State is dotted all over with aviation training camps for the Army. Speaking of aviation, I have no doubt that Texas is providing not only from its own sons but from the sons of other sections of the entire United States, the great bulk of the pilots and the daring spirits who will carry on the kind of war which the Senator has been so eloquently advocating.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to have that comment from the distinguished Senator from Texas. He may justly take great pride in what he has stated.

I will make a further comment which may be of interest to the Senator. In the State of Texas there is located a naval aviation school which is training personnel of the highest quality. Our Navy alone has aircraft exceeding 18,000 in number. The aircraft of our Navy are now rated at approximately twice the efficiency and fighting power of that of the entire Japanese Navy.

I continue to read from Mr. Drake's article:

Such is the magnificent opportunity now within our grasp—if only we would concentrate the bulk of our big fighting bombers at once against Germany, instead of scattering them over so many fronts. The public is inclined to believe that they are already concentrated, that a decisive air offensive is already under way. This is not true. We are still withholding bombers already produced; we are still hitting Germany with only one-third to one-fifth the power available and necessary.

If a real attack were made, the German General Staff would be up against a problem unprecedented in history. It would have to decide whether to "stick it out" until industrial Germany had become one horridifying ruin, or to surrender immediately and save what it could of Germany's working assets—upon which depend all Germany's hopes for post-war recovery.

A variety of facts support the case for concentrating our bombers and stepping up air war against Nazi targets now. As the intensity of Allied strategic bombing has

risen, the percentage of Luftwaffe losses has increased. Furthermore, Luftwaffe replacement power is being undermined by American precision bombing of Nazi aircraft production and repair centers.

The commanding officer of an American bomber station in England recently estimated that our Flying Fortresses alone had "knocked out plants producing 50 to 75 percent of the FW-190 fighters." Since then the Me-109 fighter plants at Wiener-Neustadt and Regensburg have been blasted. Imagine what might have happened during the Blitz of Britain if the Luftwaffe had extinguished even 50 percent of the Spitfire and Hurricane production.

The Luftwaffe's strength in combat planes and combat reserve is today reduced to 5,000 from 6,000 peak of 1941; while its general reserve, once 3,000, is known to have melted away.

No doubt about it, the Luftwaffe is in pretty bad shape; now, if ever, is our golden chance to knock it out of the skies. If our hard-pressing airmen can be reinforced at once, they will seal the fate of Germany as inevitably as they sealed the fate of north Africa and Sicily when they eradicated German air power in those theaters.

The trouble is that the British bombing offensive is still less than half the size considered necessary to make it decisive—but their production of big bombers is not sufficient to permit any increase. In the United States we are turning out more than enough big four-engined bombers to do the job, but these bombers are still being squandered in heroic but relatively small-scale attacks all over the map, instead of being massed for repeated and overwhelming raids on the industrial heart of our German enemy. For instance, the number of American precision bombers sent on each European mission this summer (between 200 and 300) has been only one-third the number needed—and potentially available—both to smash ground objectives most effectively and exterminate Luftwaffe fighters in the process.

Even as it is, our Fortresses and Liberators have made the Luftwaffe pay a bitter price for every attempt to resist them. Here is their box score over northwestern Europe alone for the first 7 months of 1943:

	United States bombers lost	Nazi fighters destroyed
January.....	14	22
February.....	17	47
March.....	16	141
April.....	27	145
May.....	69	348
June.....	80	321
July.....	108	500
Total.....	331	1,527

(This table does not include 1,206 fighters "probably" destroyed or damaged, nor any shot down by the 331 bombers lost, which are believed to have accounted for at least 1 or 2 enemy planes apiece.)

As a result of their losses in the British-American bombing offensive, the Germans have been forced to switch their production priorities to fighter planes. And this is very significant, because it indicates that, for the time being at least, Germany has been obliged to abandon plans for any heavy aerial offensives. At this critical stage of the war, such a defensive policy is a policy of desperation.

That is why American and British airmen are impatient to exploit their present terrific opportunity.

Mr. President, Mr. Drake is confident that we possess the air power, if we would but use it, to rapidly force the surrender or destruction of Germany. He is not so confident of the intention of our generals

to employ our bombers for that purpose. Had he been present at recent hearings of the Military Affairs Committee on the pending measure, his hopes would not have been increased. We turn now to another writer who is entirely optimistic both about our power to destroy Germany and about the purpose and will of our high command to accomplish that end. The writer to whom I now refer is W. B. Courtney, speaking by radio from London, in the Collier's magazine of September 25. While all of Mr. Courtney's article is most valuable and interesting, I shall quote only limited excerpts:

[From Collier's of September 25, 1943]

THE DESTRUCTION OF GERMANY

(By W. B. Courtney)

You will shudder many times in the days just ahead, though you may be safe at home thousands of miles away. The inability of your eyes to see or your ears to hear across the Atlantic will not exempt your sensibilities from sickening thunders and visions.

You will behold the sad and horrifying but wholly justifiable and inescapable tragedy of a great, modern nation being literally crumbled upon the face of the planet, and the sins of vicious men being scoured from their land by its rubble. Rome will be repeated a hundredfold and London a thousandfold in the cities of the Reich.

Air bombardment will so pulverize Germany in the next 6 months that a generation of diligent rebuilding will scarcely restore her. The sum total of all the world's earthquakes of recorded times concentrated upon the Fatherland couldn't raze and burn and convulse it more thoroughly.

This is the definite, measurable, terrible promise now given by allied air power as it grows swiftly toward full strength. Merely routine work remains to be done in co-operating the bombers of the R. A. F. and the Eighth United States Air Force, aided by their fighter and tactical commands, backed by the workers and the resources of our aviation industry.

Such a triumph has been quickened by a victory within victories, the vindication of daylight precision bombing which is America's greatest single contribution to the application of air force upon our enemies. This victory has been won by the Eighth United States Air Force, not over Germans, Japs or Italians, but against the home front critics of our equipment, leadership, and methods.

A HOME-FRONT VICTORY

Fighting airmen here believe that when the post-war summing up takes place, the winning of American and British faith to our Air Corps' long-cherished theory of daylight precision bombing will loom as the initial major achievement of Maj. Gen. Ira C. Eaker and his combat kids.

Just a year ago four-engined Yank-built and Yank-operated "heavies" first opened their bomb hatches over the Nazi-infested continent. They were planes of the Eighth Air Force, which is the aviation section of ETOUSA—that European Theater of Operations, United States Army. It was a very small air force then. It has grown impressively—from 12-plane jabs to 300-plane haymakers. In its first year the Eighth spewed almost 16,000 tons of explosives upon more than 100 targets, brushed 1,728 enemy fighters from the skies and damaged about 900 more, carried out 82 attacks in the full light of day. But even as you read this the Eighth will be sluicing as many bombs over Germany in a single month as it did all last year.

At any rate the Eighth—having won its two-edged victory—now flies and fights as it was designed, trained, and meant to fight; independently, precisely, and by day.

The story behind this great war drama you are now watching—the biggest air show of all time—goes back to the last war. The astonishing growth of the flight arm within the space of that one conflict, plus the development of aeronautical science in the historic post-war decade, enlivened by Billy Mitchell and climaxed by Lindbergh, made it apparent to all except die-hard land-and-sea-bound militarists that air power would be decisive next time.

On the professional military side, pressure to absorb its forces seems to be something the United States must always expect in one form or another from international allies. You will recall Pershing's fight to preserve the integrity of the A. E. F. as a strictly American undertaking. The Eighth Air Force had a comparable fight against a few British and Americans who thought it should abandon its independent daylight existence and join its personnel, equipment, and production to the R. A. F.'s.

On the lay side, the English public had good reason for lacking faith in the daylight technique of their new allies. Just 3 years ago the English people watched the daylight bombers of the Luftwaffe hosed from the skies over Kent and Surrey by English fighters until the survivors were glad to scurry back to the continent with their rudders between their wheels.

However, such authoritative English leaders as Air Chief Marshals Portal and Harris saw the different values of the American theory of daylight precision bombing and perceived at once a war chance that's little short of providential. That is the manner in which daylight precision or spot bombing and night area or saturation bombing complement, fill out and complete each other.

That both types of bombing should be available to our side, making possible a round-the-clock 24-hour-a-day thrashing of our common enemies, is the most felicitous discovery within Allied power in this war. It is literally a miraculous gift of heaven that guarantees victory.

The third cause of delay was that the Eighth, after slowly gathering its strength over half a year, was robbed for north Africa. Thenceforth, the Eighth was really acting in support of the north African expedition, a matter hitherto unrevealed. In bombing U-boat nests, it was protecting the flank of great convoys to Africa. That those convoys had no losses from U-boat action was due in large measure to the shellacking of the submarine pens by the Eighth.

Latest figures show about 6 German fighters destroyed for every 4-engined Yank. Merely as figures, these are not in our favor. In crews they mean 9 or 10 American specialists downed for every 6 German pilots. In money, the Germans can probably build 20 of their fighters for the price of 1 Fortress.

However, the overwhelming strength of American production redressed the balance in our favor. American industry works without fear of bombs. German industry struggles under the handicaps of a disorganized nation, constant raid interruptions, the killing of workmen. It is likely that for every German pilot dead in combat, scores of skilled aviation workers are killed in raids. So Germany cannot afford her losses, whereas we could afford 10 times as many as we have. The Luftwaffe is compelled to come up and meet the American heavies, for home morale, if for nothing else. Our crews say they do so with courage and resolution.

The Luftwaffe is trapped by the law of diminishing returns, with a battered home front that cannot keep up with its losses. This is the reason Allied casualties have been

diminishing. So pressed is the Luftwaffe that its black-painted and thinly armored night fighters now go up with the sturdier day fighters against the Eighth.

Yet it is not the virtues of American heavies fighting alone, but the cooperation with the night-flying R. A. F. that counts most. In a sense they are like two knight-doctors working on Hitler's fetid dragon. The R. A. F. the anesthetist that slugs the body into unconsciousness and paralyzes it. Then the Eighth comes along and with surgical precision cuts off the limbs and extracts the poison fangs.

The R. A. F. does not bomb in formation. Every plane shifts for itself over the target. In their hundreds they confuse and spread the defenses, burn and crush and devastate the whole military or industrial area in hour-long earthquakes.

The Eighth Air Force bombs in formation, all letting go at the same instant at specific things like docks, small factories, airplane plants, hangars, utilities—targets too circumscribed to be found at night. A formation of say 100 Yank heavies will lay all its bombs from 30,000 feet by this method within a circle, the diameter of which is about the length of three football fields. The roar, the jar, the terror of hundreds of tons of heavy explosives going off in a single cataclysm in a space not much larger than the Yankee Stadium is for you to imagine.

The R. A. F. is still dropping three or four times as many bomb-tons as the Eighth. The Eighth will catch up. But the present difference in tonnage is evened by the exactness, the intense focusing of the Americans' smaller deliveries. The R. A. F., for instance, could not have done the Rome job nor the Eighth that at Remscheid.

For the first time in the history of air power, a complementary bombing was done on a mature scale upon the late city of Hamburg. That erstwhile greatest seaport of the Reich was the sixteenth largest city in the world, exceeded in size by only 3 American cities and second to Berlin in population. The late Essen was in the first 75 of the earth's greatest cities.

The ordeals of Hamburg and Essen are over for this war. Their lines in the atlas are blank. Soon I think we can refer to the late Berlin—or Hanover or Bremen or Frankfurt or Leipzig. Today there's surplus evidence—from aerial reconnaissance photos, from intelligence sources, and from the "Rhine whine" seeping to neutrals—that human existence as we've known it is now utterly impossible when air force in great proportions is applied round the clock. If men continue to live in German cities listed on the allied master plan for destruction they will have to crowd out the deepest-burrowing moles and worms.

Day and night bombing has many advantages, but the greatest of all is its theft of all ease and order and familiarity of daily life. Londoners knew that, although their nights would be tough, day would bring respite when the R. A. F. fighters cleaned the skies. Germans have no such assurance. They have neither day nor night—only the bleakness of unmeasurable time. Never to leave home and family in the morning knowing they'll be there that night. Never to know, when they start the day's work, if they'll be alive to finish it. Never to have complete rest. Never to be without fear. Never to be clean. Never to have normal, decent social contacts or comforts or recreations. Civilians never with time to rebuild what's knocked down, to put together what's been torn apart, to heal bodies that have been hurt. Soldiers and airmen alerted 24 hours a day, all victims of desperate weariness and the neurosis recognized by doctors of Europe as worse than the shell shock of the last war—they are "siren happy."

Our Air Corps now has left hemisphere defense far behind. We've high altitude fighters. Soon we'll have heavy bombers capable of ranges and loads double, perhaps triple, those of the Fortresses and Liberators. Even the present heavies can be fixed with wing racks to carry three times as many bombs for special jobs. And our tactical commands are shoving the enemy's favorite weapon, the dive bomber, down his throat with a vengeance.

But war is the least predictable of the arts. There's never been an unanswerable weapon. Our airmen know the Germans may turn up a counter to day-and-night complementary bombing or to daylight precision bombing. They'll have to hurry.

Berlin's numbered days as a real place upon the map promise something beyond an ultimate demonstration of the power of round-the-clock bombing. Berlin in modern times came to be more than the capital of Germany, more than the heart, brains, and nerve center of the monster. It was the false-front showcase that Hitler erected upon rotten national morale left by the defeat and revolution of the last war and the inflationary years of aftermath. In it he displayed his successes and sold the Germans his bill of goods. The decayed foundations are still there and will be revealed when Berlin passes from reality into dust. Not only German courage but that most important thing, German hope, will then collapse.

BERLIN WILL MARK THE END

Based on what I know from years of work as a correspondent in Germany, from sitting in air-raid shelters with German people and being in the field with German soldiers, I am taking bets without qualifications, without "on the other hands" and "we shall see," that with the end of Berlin will come the end of the Nazis. Whether it will also mean the end of the European war depends on diplomatic and political fronts as much as military.

And this bombing you are now seeing holds an even further promise. Killing of men has not stopped wars. The spectacle of utter devastation of a homeland might. That's the wish, at any rate, of your flying young men who are now visiting history's greatest reign of terror on Germany—where live the only people who'd really like to see the Eighth United States Air Force abandon daylight bombing.

[At this point Mr. DOWNEY yielded to Mr. McNARY, who suggested the absence of a quorum, and the roll was called, after which Mr. DOWNEY yielded to Mr. LODGE, who addressed the Senate, and whose remarks appear earlier in today's proceedings.]

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish now to present to the Senate an article by Cy Caldwell from the authoritative *Aero Digest* of August 1943. From the data and the conclusions presented by Mr. Caldwell we must believe he is of the opinion Germany could be rapidly conquered or destroyed by a concentration of Allied air power, but while Mr. Courtney in his Collier's article happily assumes such a policy of the high command, Mr. Caldwell is rather dogmatically confident that our generals and admirals will never be willing to admit the futility of navies and land armies and will insist on their utilization in far-flung ventures by land and sea even though the surrender of our enemies could be forced at small loss by the use of air power exclusively.

In advance, I wish to declare that I am not in agreement with Mr. Caldwell's

conclusions that our high command will refrain from crushing Germany by the use of available air power so that they will not lose the opportunity to play the game of war with far-flung armies and navies. I am rather of the opinion that ancient concepts of military strategy so influence the thinking of our high command that it has been impossible for its members to comprehend that major war power has passed from the land and sea to the skies above and that final decisions may now be forced by the total destruction of cities, transportation, utilities, and production centers without which no people can exist; no defense can be made; no army can be maintained.

But whatever the motivation of our high command, if they much longer continue to absorb huge amounts of our production in futilely building a land army beyond our ability to use it, if they continue thereby to hamper the building of our air power to maximum capacity, if they longer delay to force the surrender of Germany by the full use of our bombers, then the day will not be long delayed when the voice of America will be raised in horror and indictment, proclaiming the waste and sacrifice inherent in the strategy of our high command. I hope and pray that, before it is too late, our Government will review and replan our military program so that it may be made consistent with rational principles of modern warfare that should now be patent to all; and to that end, I urge that Congress by the passage of the pending Wheeler bill, will indicate to our military leaders their desire to force the destruction or surrender of our enemies with the smallest possible loss of our young men and the least possible injury to the peoples of Europe.

Herewith are excerpts from the Caldwell article and let me repeat I do not agree with all of his statements:

AIR POWER WITH LAND AND SEA FORCES

(By Cy Caldwell)

Controlling factor in American war effort has been the necessarily long lines of communication to war fronts, requiring production of vast shipping services and huge naval building not only for their protection but to counterbalance Japan's naval strength.

Expansion of ground forces in artillery, tanks, and enough infantry to help air and naval forces seize control of such bases for future operations, as Sicily, is never questioned. What airmen, in general, take exception to—and declare to be an old-fashioned concept of warfare—is the production of a huge ground army, evidently intended for the invasion of the Continent itself. Airmen claim, and with reason, that this is an expensive way to fight a war, from the standpoint of loss of life. An air force of 50,000, say the air enthusiasts, or perhaps even 100,000, with their attendant ground crews and supply services, can accomplish what an army of a million men on the ground cannot accomplish, without the loss of more than half of their strength.

COSTLY JOB

This may or may not prove to be true. Indications are that invasion of the Continent, even preceded by tremendous air-force preparation, will be costly in life. Investment and blockade by air, on the other hand, would seem to be relatively inexpensive in life loss. It is, for instance, conceivable that a force of heavy bombers numbering some

3,000 in all, with the power to drop 40,000 tons a month upon German industry and lines of communication, might have a decisive effect within a period of 6 months or a year.

This plan was advocated some 10 months ago by armchair strategists and editors. In brief, this air plan calls in its first phase for the use of a total force of 3,000 United States-British heavy bombers, with 1,000 operational and 2,000 in combat reserve. Planes available for each attack, 1,000, losses 3 to 5 percent. In 8 day and 10 night attacks per month, losses would be 370 in combat, or say 500 from all operational causes. Such a force could drop 40,000 tons of bombs per month; could continue indefinitely.

Present estimates indicate that there are 1,500 heavy bombers available for this task—United States and British. In 2 months 3,000 could be available. It might be, and probably would be necessary to skimp deliveries of heavy bombers to other fronts. But this would be sound, following the age-old military policy of concentration of force. It has been pointed out that the loss rate would drop with the increase in Allied air strength. Taking the present rate, as demonstrated by the war, of 5 German fighters destroyed for the loss of 1 American bomber, the first 60 days of operations would result in the loss of 1,200 German fighters, to our loss of 240 bombers. German fighter strength might be expected to grow progressively weaker; our and British bomber strength progressively stronger. If German forces did not come up and fight, our American-British losses would be cut to a fraction, and our forces could proceed unopposed except by antiaircraft fire.

SECOND PHASE

In the second phase, the Air Force would be brought up to a strength of 4,000 bombers—2,000 operational, the balance in combat reserve. Average loss now would be 3 percent per raid; replacements necessary, 560 per month. Tons dropped per month would be 80,000; in 60 days, 160,000. Total casualties over Germany are estimated at 20,000, many of whom would escape death by parachute, as they do now. A total of 4 to 6 months has been set from the beginning of the first phase to the final collapse of Germany, always provided that the intensity of the attacks be maintained.

Now, this has all the earmarks of a well-reasoned, logical plan. From the remarks of such experienced airmen as General Spaatz, General Eaker, and Air Marshal Harris it seems evident that it would find ready acceptance in the controlling air minds of the United States Army Air Forces and the Royal Air Force. That, of course, is a guess, based on casual statements these officers have made from time to time to the press, but it's a reasonable guess. Do the General Staff accept the air plan as being feasible? They don't say.

Let us suppose that the controlling war council of the United Nations, which includes the political heads of our countries as well as the top military leaders, accepts this plan in its entirety. Let us suppose that, appalled by the loss of life in various landing operations around the globe, the council decides to try to reduce Germany by air power alone, succeeds in smashing that nation's will to continue the war, and forces it to sue for peace. In that event, the ground forces would simply sit comfortably by while air power won the war. Not a single life need be lost in the ground armies—provided the air plan were successful. The armies would simply march in to the wrecked continent and accept surrender.

Better still, General Eaker or General Spaatz or Air Chief Marshal Harris might simply parachute to some convenient spot such as Unter den Linden, and accept the

surrender of Germany personally. In that event, the huge ground army that we have built would look rather foolish, sitting in Sicily or England or north Africa, waiting patiently until the bold airmen assured them that the war was over, and they could go home, after having enjoyed a nice trip to Europe and a rest on the shores of the blue Mediterranean.

HUMAN NATURE

Does it not at once appear that no general, British or American, could for one moment entertain such a prospect? Does it not also appear that old sea dogs of the British and American Navies would sooner lose their right arms and all their teeth rather than permit such a calamity to occur? Here we consider not war forces alone but that unchangeable force, human nature. This observer submits that it would be humanly impossible for generals and admirals, who have spent up to 40 years learning their professions, to sit down tamely on some safe shore or in some quiet harbor, while the new blue-sky buccaneers of warfare showed them up as mere auxiliaries of air power. It is a safe prediction, even amid war's uncertainties, that armies and navies will fight right through the war, and right to the end. They will not be permitted to sit back while the airmen demonstrate a cheaper and more effective way of winning.

This is not to blame the generals and admirals for taking that stand. It is simply to point out that wars are run by human beings, and that generals and admirals are just as human as the rest of us, and have no intention of sitting calmly on the sidelines while a relatively small number of airmen—small, that is, compared to the numbers of men in the ground armies and in the navies—proved that so far as modern war was concerned the general and the admirals could go join the dinosaur and the pterodactyl, taking their places as just so many more fossil remains. Generals and admirals are made of sterner stuff than that. Until war's end, they will hurl their men against every obstacle, drop them by glider and parachute behind every fortified line—and give them a bayonet and a hand grenade to use when they come to personal grips with the enemy.

If this reasoning proves to be correct, then we may expect to see all forces used concurrently in the invasion and conquest of continental Europe. This is not to say that the independent bombing of Germany will be neglected. On the contrary, it undoubtedly will be intensified, for the generals are well aware by now that without adequate air softening no army can land on a hostile shore against an enemy only half as strong but firmly entrenched in fortified positions. However, there seems to be no doubt whatever that the independent bombing of Germany will not be given priority in British-American high command thinking, but will be meshed into the great strategic plan, which obviously includes concurrent ground invasion.

Irrespective of what air plans are advanced, what books are written, what editorials are composed, the generals will hurl their forces in, let the loss of life be what it may.

Mr. President, Mr. Caldwell, in discussing a hypothetical plan to bomb Germany out of the war, assumes the availability of 3,000 Allied bombers for a 60-day period and 4,000 thereafter for another 60 days and uses as an index the current rate of losses in bombing operations over Germany. We could expect in this 4-month period a loss of almost 2,000 Allied units. These would be replaced during the operations. Such

bombers would drop a total of 240,000 tons during the 4 months, which should be plenty, it would appear, to force Nazi surrender.

Have the English and American forces sufficient aircraft and flying personnel to implement the proposed program? We have indeed, and a safe margin beyond that. But have we enough flyers and fighters and bombers for the destruction of Germany and to supply the needs of MacArthur and China at the same time? We quite certainly have, and, while the data showing present bomber production is not for publication, it is available to any Senator and plainly indicates a present and potential sufficiency not only for the destruction of Germany but likewise for every other essential purpose.

It is true, of course, that if our bombing strength is diverted to opening new combat areas and to support a great European invasion, the proposed program against Germany could not be carried out. Indeed, it is possible that under such circumstances the current rate of operations necessarily would be reduced.

Would the dropping of 240,000 tons of bombs on Germany in 4 months be sufficient to conquer or destroy her? To secure an answer, let us weigh comparative figures.

Coventry was struck and destroyed by 250 tons; London was badly shaken in the Battle of Britain by the weight of 6,600 tons delivered over a 3-month period. Hamburg, in a few hours, was crumbled to the earth by the explosive power of 10,000 tons. Before anyone argues that Germany cannot be destroyed by bombing because London was not, he should recall that 10 percent of what we could now hurl on Germany within 4 months, that is, 24,000 tons, would have blasted and burned the English metropolis from the face of the earth.

It is doubtful that the Reich could endure even 60 days of saturated and precision bombing as proposed and not the slightest chance that she could withstand such terrible destruction for 2 months beyond that.

The 20 largest cities in greater Germany contained, before this war, an aggregate population of 16,700,000. Here they are:

Berlin	4,242,501
Vienna	2,091,541
Hamburg	1,675,703
Munich	773,095
Cologne	756,605
Leipzig	715,668
Essen	654,461
Dresden	642,129
Breslau	625,198
Frankfurt	555,857
Düsseldorf	498,600
Dortmund	540,875
Hannover	444,926
Stuttgart	420,533
Duisburg	306,895
Nuremberg	412,745
Wuppertal	408,602
Königsberg	328,241
Bremen	323,331
Chemnitz	350,734
Total	16,700,240

Nearly all of these cities already have been cruelly hit and hurt by precision and saturation bombing, and Hamburg, Essen, Cologne, and Hannover have been largely depopulated as a result. It will be noted that their aggregate population before this war was approximately 16,700,000, and that Hamburg had about 10 percent of the total number; that is, 1,675,000. Since Hamburg was crumbled by the explosive power of 10,000 tons of bombs, we might reasonably expect that 100,000 tons would be sufficient to disintegrate nearly all the larger cities of greater Germany.

While future bombing raids may average longer trips than in the past, let it be noted that German defenses in the air and on the ground constantly weaken and that a substantial part of the task of destruction already has been accomplished. Certainly the suggested 240,000 tons would be amply sufficient for its allotted task.

After careful and considered checking and many consultations with air experts, I am convinced that Nazi surrender can be forced almost immediately by concentrated bombing and at a negligible cost. Why our high command does not seek an immediate decision remains to me a deep and perplexing mystery.

Over a year ago, Air Marshal Harris proclaimed the possibility of bombing the Nazis out of the war within a few months. De Seversky, Huie, Williams, in fact every airpower expert, so far as I know, has been in agreement. And our own ranking air officers are emphatically of this opinion.

Mr. de Seversky adds his voice to the other airpower experts by an article in the American Mercury of October 1943. It is as follows:

THE MYTH OF "FORTRESS EUROPE"

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

Orthodox military writers assume that Nazi Germany, having lost the initiative in the war, may elect to fight it defensively. It will shorten its lines wherever possible and dig in for a prolonged siege. And German propaganda has accepted this assumption. The very phrase *Festung Europa*—fortress Europe—now so prominent in Dr. Goebbels' new threats and allis, implies a siege behind impregnable walls. According to the Nazi version, the enemy's successes in the Mediterranean and on the Russian front have not really breached the fortress within which the Germans can survive against the entire outside world.

The whole idea, however, is nothing more than a hang-over from the past. If Goebbels expresses serious German military opinion in the talk of *Festung Europa*, then such opinion is as backward as the view—held in Germany and by some of our own commentators after the Battle of Britain—that strategic bombing is of no military value. But more likely German propaganda is puffing up the possibilities of defensive warfare to bolster a tottering morale, without real faith in it.

Because the fact is that air power has forever ended the concept of impregnable fortifications. In the epoch of surface warfare a strong wall was enough to keep out an enemy. The Maginot Line is the last great monument to that epoch. Since the advent of air power, a wall is not enough. A roof, too, is required, otherwise destruction will rain down on the besieged area from overhead.

The question, therefore, is whether the Germans can provide their European fortress with a roof of defensive air power; whether they can establish what some refer to as a "vertical front." And the answer is that they cannot do it. Bombers will always crash through, and given an attacker with adequate air power of the proper types, an effective roof over the fortress is out of the question. It has always been a sound military principle that the most effective defense is a vigorous offensive.

In aerial warfare this principle amounts to a law to which there are few if any exceptions. To make its "fortress" hope come true, Germany must ward off Allied demolition from the skies—the kind of round-the-clock bombardment of which it has already had substantial samples. But this it can do, in the final analysis, only by stopping the air offensive at its source, which means an offensive against Allied airfields, factories, fuel concentrations, and other sources of air power.

There are those who cite the Battle of Britain as proof that successful defensive action on the home grounds is possible. The Royal Air Force, they point out, succeeded in defeating the Luftwaffe in a battle fought over the British Isles. Why could not German defensive aviation in the same way defeat the Allied onslaught from above, thus adding a roof to its fortress walls?

Theoretically that is conceivable. Practically, we know that the Battle of Britain was unique. The attacking aircraft were so deficient in military characteristics that, looking back at the episode, we can only marvel at the military stupidity of Marshal Goering and his aviation associates. They sent in swarms of bombers that were virtually unarmed in broad daylight, against British Spitfires and Hurricanes armed to the teeth. The qualitative gap between the invaders and the defenders was so wide that it was almost like a mob of savages with bows and arrows attacking a contingent of white men armed with guns. What is more, German strategic ideas in the Battle of Britain were all false. Instead of concentrating for a knock-out blow against the opposing air power, in the air and on the ground, Goering squandered planes and lives on blasting population centers and other morale targets.

Given a discrepancy in weapons and strategic good sense such as saved the British Isles, it is possible to throw a cover of air power over an area. But Germany today cannot hope for any such discrepancy in its favor. Both sides have learned a lot from the Battle of Britain and a score of other engagements since then. Neither side can count on mistakes of major proportions by its opponents. Today the forces are technologically more or less evenly matched, even if we give Germany credit for maximum strength. Under those conditions there can be no such thing as an impregnable defense. Bombardment aviation will penetrate, even if losses are heavy, and for all practical purposes the Germans will be trapped in a fortress without a roof.

The logic of modern air power forces us to a specific conclusion: If the Germans go over to a purely defensive strategy, their doom will be sealed. Such strategy is today a myth, and those who preached it only a few years ago seem as anachronistic as if they belonged to the era of Caesar or Napoleon.

II

The only plan, from the vantage point of air power, is to ignore this fortress. We must continue to bomb across its walls and to demolish the core of Axis strength, which is the complex of industries, communication lines, and other strategic objectives in Germany proper. As in the case of any territory under artillery bombardment, the more concen-

trated, continuous, and thorough this bombardment the smaller will be the total effort and sacrifice needed to cause a collapse.

However, it should be remembered that from the point of view of the old surface strategy, Europe is still a fortress—and that many Allied military men still see the scene primarily from that point of view. If we accept the Goebbels fiction and proceed to storm the European ramparts instead of ignoring them, then the myth will suddenly become a deadly reality. Then we shall no longer be fighting on our terms but on Germany's terms, and the Germans will be able to fight back.

There may be any number of valid political reasons why an invasion of western Europe—a storming of the fortress—should be undertaken. There were other occasions in this war when political considerations were at variance with strictly military good sense. The British attempt to defend Holland and Belgium, for instance, was essentially a political obligation, without much hope of improving the military position and with a huge risk of disaster. The British defense of Greece, likewise, was largely the fulfillment of a moral and political obligation, undertaken with the knowledge that in splitting the small British forces the entire African position was endangered.

Furthermore, the top leadership of our war effort today is composed for the most part of men of an old military school, considerably set in its ways. They are responsible for the channelling of an overwhelming portion of our national wealth and labor power into surface weapons. Quite naturally they are itching to employ those accumulated weapons—the great navies, the millionfold armies, the mountains of equipment.

Despite the accomplishments of air power in limited doses with inadequate planes, such men are sincerely worried by an honest lack of faith in all-out aerial strategy—except as an "extra" method on an experimental basis. An unshakable faith in surface procedures, plus the desire to justify in dramatic and victorious operations their former decisions in building what is essentially a surface war machine, therefore impel them to plunge into an old-style mile-by-mile frontal attack on Festung Europa.

By the time these words see print indeed, it is not impossible that the frontal attack may have been decided upon. Even if successful, it will involve a high price in allied lives and matériel. The enemy will then retreat and contract its "fortress." Every contraction, by shortening the lines to be defended, will tend to strengthen the walls of the "fortress." Under the most favorable circumstances, it will be a long and costly enterprise; the experience in Tunisia, where nearly everything was stacked in our favor, is proof of how slow surface operations necessarily are. Those who are impatient with air power, which has had only an inadequate opportunity with retarded equipment, will face a more harrowing test of their patience when a full-parade invasion gets going.

Should Germany succeed in repelling a major invasion on the western coast of Europe, the game will not be up. The Allied cause would suffer a terrific moral blow. But "Fortress Europe" will be as accessible as ever to third-dimensional strategy aiming directly at Germany's solar plexus. We would then have to undertake out of necessity, and after the expenditure of myriad lives, the kind of war that is now open to us as a matter of intelligent choice.

Should the German Festung be stormed and overwhelmed, at a hideous price in casualties, the myth of surface strategy of the preaviation epoch would be perpetuated. It would then be solemnly attested by old-style military leaders and writers that this war, like the previous one, was won by the man

with the bayonet and the man in the tank. The victorious nations would continue to pile up surface weapons and maintain immense standing armies, despite the fact that they have been made largely superfluous, except as follow-up and auxiliary services by the air weapon. History might then repeat itself tragically. Because the First World War ended in the trenches, France staked its life on a supertrench, the Maginot Line. Should this war be ended by surface operations, there would be the same danger that the victors would maintain faith in two-dimensional strategy, leaving it to others to exploit air power to the full.

To airmen, judging the picture solely from the military angle and without reference to political factors, it seems entirely unnecessary to accept the fortress concept. They believe that only a small fraction of the industrial potential and manpower represented by a full-parade invasion, if translated into true air power and given full opportunity to operate in line with its own strategy, could knock out Germany from above. The surface forces would then enter Festung Europa as occupying forces rather than invasion forces.

Mr. President, so far in this address I have not mentioned the Russian front. I hope no one will conclude from that omission that I do not grant to the Russian nation the major credit for having helped to bring Germany to her present plight. It is probable that of all the punishment inflicted on the Allies 90 percent has been absorbed by Russia. Her resistance and recuperative power have amazed the world and her sledgehammer blows against the Hitler hordes have helped to weaken the whole of Germany so that she is now prone for the fatal and final blow by our air power.

If it is argued that Russia may soon drive through to her own frontiers and rest there, and perhaps even make peace with her enemy, and that anticipating the possibility of such an event we should continue to create a greater land army, then I reply that such a possibility should but energize us to seek the quickest possible destruction of Hitler and that by powerful and ruinous air blows. If a Russian peace should release the millions of Nazi soldiers now on the eastern front so that they could be thrown against the British and Americans on the western, then, indeed, would our invasion of Germany be most hazardous and the most fearfully destructive to our own forces.

The military hordes of Hitler might so well defend their European fortress that we could never shake it by ground attack; certainly the magnificent German Army could exact a price of American and British lives that would be appalling. And if it should happen in an invasion, when we were prepared to meet only a portion of the German forces, suddenly the whole weight was thrown at us, then national tragedy and terrible disaster might well ensue.

Even if peace on the eastern front should release millions of the Reich soldiers for use against us, they would be of little value against our aircraft. German airpower, of course, now held on the eastern line, if freed to defend German cities against air attack, would make our operations more difficult. For that very reason a decision should be forced and

gained by air blows and at once. Too long have we waited now; further delay cannot be justified.

Mr. Churchill in his latest address suggested the possibility, or even probability, of new and more destructive German weapons to be employed against our air forces. Would the probability of a more potent Nazi defense against our bombing justify the delay of concentrated air blows or of great additions to our present land forces which it is admitted cannot add to our striking power against Germany for 12, 15, or 18 months?

In every war there is always the possibility of novel methods, new equipment, more potent weapons, that might increase the power of one side or another. This very fact should have energized our high command to have sought the destruction of Hitler by air long before this as recommended by Marshal Harris. Our military leaders will now be guilty of most extreme neglect if with the present probability of new German antiaircraft weapons, as suggested by Mr. Churchill, we do not apply to her the crushing power which we now have in overwhelming abundance.

Mr. President, if I may address myself to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky at this stage of my address, I wish to ask unanimous consent that I may submit my resolution and that it may be immediately considered and adopted. I desire to say to the distinguished majority leader that the minority leader [Mr. McNARY] told me he would raise no objection to that procedure; the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, made the same statement; the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], whose bill is pending before the Senate, and which will be affected, made the same statement. I regret that they are not on the floor to speak for themselves.

Mr. BARKLEY. Much as I respect all the gentlemen named by the Senator from California, it has no bearing upon my attitude and no influence upon my attitude whatever. I do not think the pending bill ought to be laid aside for the purpose of considering a resolution which has not been considered, which involves possibly calling here important Army and Navy officers, holding an indefinite investigation and submitting a report. The resolution itself undertakes to say when consideration of the pending bill shall be again resumed. It seems to me to be very unwise to pursue that course, and I shall have to object.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I then wish to offer to our distinguished majority leader to strike out of the resolution the provision which would attempt to defer action on the pending measure until the committee had made its report. Likewise, if the Senator will not otherwise consent to the adoption of the resolution by unanimous consent, I will agree to strike out the provision suggesting that we should call high ranking air officers for this investigation. Then, I understand from what the majority leader has said that by making the resolution acceptable to him by these last two qualifications, he would be willing to

have committees of the United States Senate inquire into this rather tragic and important issue.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not going to consent that the resolution shall be considered now in any form. It is not the logical and orderly way in which to proceed. There are many objections to giving consent to the consideration of a resolution of that sort at this time, a resolution undertaking to instruct two standing committees of the Senate to hold joint sessions, and to make a joint report, and all that; I cannot consent to it. I shall insist that the resolution go to the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been made.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the sincerity of the Senator from California, but we have got to proceed in an orderly way, and it seems to me it is not conducive to orderly legislation to interrupt the consideration of a bill which has been debated by the Senate for 2 or 3 days in order to adopt a resolution of any kind providing for holding another investigation before we can proceed further with the subject under consideration. I think we ought to proceed in the regular way.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the distinguished Senator will defer to me for a moment let me say I can understand and perhaps concede that the attitude of the Senator in respect to deferring a vote upon the fathers' draft bill while this investigation was being made is correct.

He probably very sincerely and honestly believes what our Army chiefs say, that we need these fathers for essential military purposes. I cannot agree with that, but, of course, the Senator's viewpoint is different, consequently I can understand why he would want action taken upon the Wheeler bill at the earliest possible time. But I must admit I stand in some amazement that he objects to the resolution as I have offered to amend it. For 2 days I have submitted the statements of air experts and of the high ranking air-power men in England and the United States. I have submitted here the statement of Donald Nelson, and other data, all of which reveal, so plainly that anyone should be able to understand their meaning, that if our high command goes through with its present plans, American boys and British and Canadians by the hundreds of thousands, without justification, will be crippled, killed, scarred, and burned. If it were merely the junior Senator from California talking, I could understand the Senator from Kentucky would think that what I said was not of enough importance to set in motion the machinery of this body; but I have quoted here from Winston Churchill, who, in effect, says almost identically the same thing. From the head of the British bombing command, and in magazine articles purporting to speak the opinions of our own air chiefs, I have still in my files statements of every important air-power expert that I know to the same effect.

I say to the distinguished Senator that if under those conditions he is not will-

ing to help me in my effort to have a full, candid, and complete investigation of this issue, I, of course, must abide by what he says, but if history shall write and record that through a tragic blunder as to our air policy the lives of hundreds of thousands, or millions, of American, Canadian, and British boys are wasted and destroyed, I should never like to feel that I had not been willing at least to have the facts fully revealed in the light of day by a congressional investigation.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield to me, I should like to make one simple observation. I do not wish to enter into any controversy at this time with the Senator from California over his theory that the war can be won in the air alone. Of course, that would contribute nothing to the real winning of the war, no matter how long he and I might indulge in a controversy of that sort.

I do not believe the strategy of this war can be worked out on the floor of the United States Senate. Nor do I believe it can be worked out by an ex parte resolution sponsored by a single Senator.

We have spent millions upon millions of dollars educating our military and naval leaders. Throughout the whole history of this Nation we have maintained at West Point a training center for the training of military officers, and at the Naval Academy at Annapolis a school for the training of naval officers. After those men get their academic education in those institutions, they spend the remainder of their lives in the uniform of their country, studying warfare, the history of warfare, and the strategy of warfare. If after the expenditure of all that money and time we cannot trust those men, upon whom rests the responsibility of winning the war where the fighting is and will be, then we are sunk.

I frankly say that, much as I respect the Senator from California and much as I respect the Senate of the United States, I should not be willing to stake the victory of the American Nation in the war upon strategy which could be worked out here, either by a single Senator, or by us all together.

Whether such an investigation as the Senator proposes would result in anything, I do not know, I am not saying. Certainly I should not be willing to accept as conclusive, or even as persuasive, the suggestion that General Arnold, head of our Air Corps, or General Marshall, who enjoys the unlimited confidence of the American people, and I believe of all the world, because of his military ability, or that Admiral King, Admiral Leahy, and all our other military and naval officers, have not given consideration to this whole subject and all the possibilities involved in the type of warfare necessary to be adopted and the instruments with which it has to be fought in order to win the war as completely and as promptly as possible.

Even in his address to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress, as I recall, Prime Minister Winston Churchill stated that he did not know, or was not in a position to assert, whether Germany

could be defeated by air, but that they were feeling the situation out, and that there was no harm in trying to see, so far as they could, what could be done in the air. They are alert to that situation. They are informed about it, not only from the standpoint of the training of men, but also from the standpoint of the production of airplanes. They are familiar with all that. They know what the situation is. They know what they can depend upon, they know how many planes they can get and where they can get them, and it seems to me it is a mistake for us here to assume that these men who are charged with the responsibility of conducting the war, literally and actually, have not given consideration to every possibility and every probability, and have not explored all the avenues of approach to this subject.

I feel that it would cause a serious hiatus, in all probability, if the Senate of the United States should now interrupt the program being followed in order to try to find out whether our military and naval commanders have been wrong about their whole theory of the war, and whether they are proceeding upon a false basis. I do not assume they are. I would not concede it. I do not believe it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I think perhaps a large part of the difference between the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and me is due to the fact that we do not understand the facts in the same way. The distinguished Senator just finished saying that he thought we could rely upon the statement of General Arnold and General Eaker and General Kenney and other air power military leaders. I do, too. I agree with the Senator. Evidently the distinguished Senator was too busy with his conferences when I read magazine articles purporting to state the opinions of these very men as believing that a great land invasion is not necessary and that the war could be won in the air. Likewise perhaps the distinguished Senator did not hear me read the quotation from the leader of the English bombing forces, Air Marshal Harris, by many men considered the ablest expert in air warfare today.

Mr. President, we are now confronted here by an issue which I shall state, and if the distinguished majority leader will utilize his high degree of intellect upon the facts, I believe he must admit it. This is the situation. We have a group of rather elderly men who now are in control of the high command of the Nation. They went to West Point or Annapolis, if they attended those military academies at all, before the last war. I do not think any one of them has ever flown a plane. They apparently have no idea of the modern concepts of air war.

In any event the young men who have come out of West Point or Annapolis in the last 5, 10, 15, yes, and 20 years, are saying that we are guilty of stupidity in not using this weapon of power and destruction which a great technological civilization has given into our hands. We have here then a few men in high command apparently determined on great land invasions, and to use the air

power to advance those armies, and we have on the other hand many of the ranking officers of the air power in both the British and American services supported by civilian experts who say that the high command is wrong. If the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States, when an issue of this kind is presented, are not willing to begin an immediate investigation, then indeed we have ceased to be the representatives of our people.

Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Kentucky, whom I admire so deeply, and for whom I have such a deep affection, would not say that I on the floor of the Senate am attempting to dictate military strategy. That statement is not justified. It is unfair. I have been quoting here from data and from statements made by experts merely as a basis for asking this administration more carefully to consider and to investigate what should be done under the conditions which exist.

Mr. President, I would not even be here, as certain as I am of the righteousness of my cause, unless I was supported by the able air-power authorities of this Nation. I realize that air officials and air experts are human, like the rest of us. If Seversky becomes a crusader for air power, he ceases to become disinterested. When Generals Eaker, Chennault, Arnold, and Kenney become leaders of the Air Force then surely from then on they are prejudiced in favor of their own field of power. Of course, any Senate committee, as well as the Congress of the United States, should weigh that human factor of prejudice which undoubtedly exists in their minds, in determining whether or not experts are right or wrong.

But, Mr. President, I wish to say this: It seems to me that no Senate committee could sit down for a few hours with Donald Nelson and learn what bombing capacity we have, and then could see what destruction bombing capacity is now accomplishing in Germany, without knowing that Germany right today totters toward wreck and ruin.

Mr. President, Hamburg was destroyed by 10,000 tons of bombs. London, in the Battle of Britain, received only 6,600 tons. In 4 months we can pour upon the cities of the Reich 240,000 tons of bombs.

Mr. President, does the distinguished majority leader desire me to yield further to him?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not necessarily.

Mr. DOWNEY. I did not know. The Senator seemed desirous of speaking.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought I understood the Senator from California awhile ago, when he asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of his resolution, to say that he had concluded his remarks, and that upon my objection he intended to yield the floor. Perhaps I was misinformed.

Mr. DOWNEY. No, my statement was to the contrary; that I still have reports of noted experts on air power and much data which it is my intention to place in the RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to that, I will say to the Senator, although I had received information from the author of the bill which is pending, who has temporarily left the floor, that the Senator from California intended to conclude his remarks this afternoon, and that the Senator from Montana would resume tomorrow.

Mr. DOWNEY. I must admit that that had been my expectation. I could not conceive that any Senator would not immediately want a prompt and fair consideration of this issue.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have objected to consideration of the resolution, and I have objected for reasons which I think are sufficient. I do not care to enter into any controversy over the reason for my objections. They are effective. If the Senator from California desires to debate that question further he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me say to the distinguished leader that he is just as effective in sabotaging what I should like to do as the British bombs are in destroying the city of Berlin. I realize that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the use of that term is unjustified.

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have done what I think it my duty to do in the orderly, parliamentary procedure of the Senate, and if objection to a resolution to go out on a wild-goose chase in order to suspend legislation on the subject which we have before us is to be termed as "sabotaging," the Senator from California is welcome to his terminology.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished majority leader that I was speaking facetiously in using the word "sabotage."

Mr. BARKLEY. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the newspapers of the country do not deal in "facetiousity." [Laughter.]

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well. Then I hope the press of the United States will carry my sentiments this way, that the Senator's objection to my resolution is just as effective in stopping what I am attempting to do as the bombing by the Allies might be in stopping the German war effort. I wish to strike out of the RECORD the word "sabotage." It was used facetiously. I regret if it seems offensive to the Senator that I used that word.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, the Senator—

Mr. DOWNEY. I was simply attempting to say that by what the distinguished Senator had done he had effectively stopped consideration of my resolution. That certainly he did have the effective power and he was using it to stop consideration of the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, and any other Senator would have the same effective power.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to say, since the Senator has brought in the name of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that I consulted the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs as to where this resolution should go, and he

agreed that it should go to the Committee on Military Affairs. Other Senators whom I consulted agreed. If the Senator feels that I have deprived him of some parliamentary rights by insisting that the resolution take the regular course and go where it ought to go, I am sorry, but I cannot change my course in order to accommodate his views about that. I say that with the greatest deference and the greatest affection for the Senator from California. I think there is no Senator for whom I have a greater affection than I have for the Senator from California whose cooperation I frequently appreciate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution. Objection was made to that request, and under the rule the resolution goes over.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour and the apparent impossibility to have these arguments and the presentation of the data heard by enough Senators to make it worth while, I would now ask unanimous consent that I may do something which I think will afford great relief to the majority leader, and, I am sure, to the minority leader, who is always kind to me, also. I shall ask that I may include in the RECORD, without reading, the additional data and material and statement I have, and that they may be carried in the RECORD as a part of my speech. That will satisfy me. Under those conditions I will be glad to conclude now.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not urging the Senator from California to conclude. I have probably been misinformed.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may include as a part of my remarks, without reading or statement, further data and material I have.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution submitted by the Senator be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOWNEY. First, Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. To what other committee could the resolution be referred?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. It could be referred to any committee. However, request has been made that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. Without objection, that will be done. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. DOWNEY. I ask the Presiding Officer to postpone putting that question until I have received certain parliamentary information. Under the normal procedure of the Senate, to what committee would one expect such a resolution to be referred?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. It would go to the Committee on Military Affairs, but could be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. DOWNEY. Very well. Of course, under those conditions, I have no objection.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution (S. Res. 182) is referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further reports of committees?

NOMINATION OF UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE AND DIPLOMATIC NOMINATIONS REPORTED

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report the nominations of Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of State; the nomination of Elvin Seibert, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America; and the nomination of John W. Bailey, Jr., of Texas, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general of the United States of America.

In this connection, Mr. President, because of the present posture of international relations and the probable absence from the country of the Secretary of State at an early date, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination of Mr. Stettinius to be Under Secretary of State.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my attention has just now been called to the request of the very distinguished senior Senator from Texas. I desire to ask some questions of him about the nomination.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad to be interrogated.

Mr. McNARY. Is the report from the committee, and in the committee did it meet with unanimous accord?

Mr. CONNALLY. I was about to state that the committee had an unusually large attendance at its meeting this morning. There were four absentees: The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who is absent because of illness; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who sent a proxy asking that he be recorded in favor of a favorable report on the nomination; the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYN-

OLDS], who also sent a proxy, so the clerk has advised me; and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Other than that, the report was absolutely unanimous. The candidate was available in the committee room; and, after the proceedings, he came before the committee, and was subject to interrogation, and there was a very pleasant session with the committee.

Mr. McNARY. That is very interesting to know. Did the committee authorize the chairman to request the consideration of the nomination be had today?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. Frankly, I do not think I propounded that matter to the committee. After the committee adjourned, representations were made to me about the urgency of the situation because of the fact that the Secretary of State is to be called abroad at an early date, and that it was desired that the Under Secretary be inducted as soon as possible, so as to be able to familiarize himself with the duties of the office which will devolve upon him in the absence of the Secretary. That is the only reason why I make the request.

I see present in the Chamber a number of Senators who are members of the committee, and I am sure none of them will object to the present consideration of the nomination.

Mr. McNARY. The practice of having all nominations go to the calendar is so old and so justified in experience that I hesitate to agree to a request of the kind which has been made, even though such a request comes from one of my most distinguished companions in the Senate. Criticism often comes to a Senator for permitting consideration to be given a nomination without having had the nomination first considered under the practice and rules of the Senate. Sometimes I have yielded to such a request, but only in the event there was some unusual condition surrounding the attitude of the chairman of the committee who made the report.

I know the Senator from Texas does not want to be criticized; I know I do not want to be criticized, and neither does the able senior Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader. Many times Senators who are absent from the Chamber would like to be present when matters of this kind come before the Senate. Hence, we would not have a rule if we did not have a reason for it. I have always been very careful to consider the rules of the Senate and all other matters which pertain to the procedure of this body. I have to object to consideration of the nomination before tomorrow, unless some very substantial reason is given for action on it today.

I observe that the very able senior Senator from Texas has reported three nominations, for one of which he requests present consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am perfectly willing to have consideration of the other two nominations postponed. Two for one is a fairly good proportion.

Mr. McNARY. I do not think that would be very creditable to the other two. I think they would rather have three to nothing, or nothing at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course the Senator knows that under the rule, which is a justifiable one, the nomination would be placed on the calendar, and go over until tomorrow. In all likelihood there will be no larger attendance of Senators tomorrow afternoon than there is now, so that part of the ground of the Senator's objection is probably not the most important.

As the Senator knows, Mr. Stettinius is now and has been for some time the head of the lend-lease agency. He is going from that office to the office of Under Secretary of State. I suppose, in an informal way, he could go over to the State Department tomorrow and begin to familiarize himself with his new duties, on the assumption that his nomination will be confirmed; but men hesitate to do that.

In view of the urgency of the international situation and the fact that even now the Secretary of State is absent on a brief vacation, it seems to me that the Senator might forego his usually well-grounded objection in order that this nomination may be acted upon today. Because of the situation I hope the Senator will withdraw his objection, although I realize the importance of it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have very great admiration for the nominee. I also have a very strong desire to carry out the rules of the Senate and protect Senators who are absent. To repeat, if any reason could be given why we should act today, and there were no other objection, I should probably withdraw my objection. I wish to have it understood that if I consent to action today on this appointment, it will not mean a relaxation of the rule.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me state further to the Senator from Oregon—and I am sure the Senator from Texas will agree—that if this nomination is confirmed today, and any Senator objects tomorrow, we will be willing to have the nomination reconsidered.

Mr. McNARY. That would not do. I usually give consent to have the President notified. If the President is notified, the matter goes beyond the jurisdiction of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true.

Mr. McNARY. I am not dealing in mere attitudes. The question was once decided by the Supreme Court in a case arising in my own State.

In view of the situation, and my very great admiration for the nominee, and in view of the able speeches made by my distinguished friends, the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Texas, I shall make no objection at this time to the immediate consideration of Mr. Stettinius' nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon very much. I realize that he is entirely within his rights in objecting. I would not have made the request, and I had no intention of doing so, except that it was made rather clear to me that it was highly important to have prompt action on the nomination. I hope I shall not soon have to call upon the Senator again to make a sacrifice of his convictions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I take this occasion to express my great gratification at the appointment of Mr. Stettinius to this important position. As we all know, Mr. Stettinius does not come from the diplomatic service. He comes from the outside; but his conduct in office, his conduct as a citizen and as an American since he has been in Washington in charge of important activities connected with the war, his background of education, and his broad-minded views upon the questions which affect our country admirably fit him for this high position. His more recent activities in connection with the Lend-Lease agency, of which he has been the head, have given him an intimate knowledge of the military and economic conditions of other countries which I think admirably fits him into the situation at this particular time.

I feel that the President and the country are to be congratulated upon the selection of Mr. Stettinius and his willingness to serve. He has given up his business, financial, and industrial connections to serve his country, which he has done in a peculiarly outstanding way. I feel also that Mr. Stettinius is to be congratulated on the recognition of his high qualities by his appointment to this important position.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Since the Senator is making the record, I think he would be happy to have me add that from the minority side of the Foreign Relations Committee the sentiment totally reflected the statements which the Senator now makes regarding Mr. Stettinius.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that fact, and I thank the Senator for calling it to my attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Coast Guard nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, October 1, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 30 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Frank C. Squire, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 29, 1948. (Vice M. Roland Reed.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named assistant surgeons to be temporary passed assistant surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Alfred L. Holloman	George W. Comstock
Kenneth Grant	Anthony J. Lund
James Lloyd Elliott	Herbert Tabor
Herbert E. Pedersen	Robert M. Thomas
Joseph L. Bryant	Spurgeon M. Wingo

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Romeo J. Gentile	Hugh L. C. Wilkerson
George K. Massengill	Charles M. McGill
David J. Zaugg	

The following-named surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Frank S. Fellows	Jacob P. Eberhardt
Elmer A. Carberry	Anthony P. Rubino

The following-named assistant surgeon, to be temporary passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 1, 1943:

William C. Lewis

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from September 1, 1943:

Alfred L. Holloman
Kenneth M. Joye
John A. Lewis

The following-named surgeon, to be temporary senior surgeon, to rank as such from September 1, 1943:

Joseph A. Bell

The following-named senior surgeon, to be temporary medical director, to rank as such from September 1, 1943:

Robert H. Onstott

The following-named passed assistant sanitary engineer, to be sanitary engineer, to rank as such from September 1, 1943:

Elmer J. Herringer

The following to be officers in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective date of oath:

Gordon E. McCallum to be passed assistant sanitary engineer.

Edmund J. Schmidt to be assistant surgeon.
George Shipman to be assistant surgeon.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be temporary passed assistant surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

John B. Spriggs Emery F. Word
Carruth J. Wagner Lyman C. Burgess

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Curtis R. Chaffin Eric C. Johnson
Erwin C. Drescher Earl L. White
Paul T. Erickson Joseph S. Spoto
John B. Hozler

The following-named surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Leroy E. Burney
Robert H. Felix

The following-named sanitary engineers to be temporary senior sanitary engineers, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

John J. Bloomfield
Judson L. Robertson, Jr.

The following-named surgeon to be temporary medical director, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Raymond A. Vonderlehr

The following-named passed assistant surgeon to be surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the date set opposite his name:

Calvin B. Spencer, October 8, 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 30 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., to be Under Secretary of State.

COAST GUARD

COMMODORES, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE COAST GUARD WHILE SERVING AS DISTRICT COAST GUARD OFFICERS, TO RANK FROM JUNE 1, 1943, FOR THE NAVAL DISTRICT INDICATED AFTER EACH NAME

Wilfred N. Derby, First Naval District.
Gordon T. Finlay, Fifth Naval District.
Joseph F. Farley, Eighth Naval District.
Philip F. Roach, Twelfth Naval District.

POSTMASTERS

MICHIGAN

Ernest R. Brodeur, Cadillac.
Harry Kramer, Holland.
Frank W. Weinau, Ida.
George J. Carlton, Mackinaw City.
Bruce S. Trace, Royal Oak.

TENNESSEE

Sadie P. Omohundro, Donelson.
Thomas D. Walker, Kerrville.
Henry G. Simpson, Middleton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou who takest thought of the humblest life which falls to the ground, we pray Thee to humble our lives before Thy infinite mercy. Thou knowest the vows we have registered and as the divinest conquest is of one's self, enable us to qualify to see visions and share spiritual victory in our own souls. O lift the curtain of the higher world and reveal Thyself to be

glorious and holy as Thy voice bids us go forward to the things which survive the wrecks of iniquitous war.

Vouchsafe, blessed Lord, to make these moments free from weakness and uncertainty; make us an inspiration to every patriotic movement. In the presence of our country's crisis may we frown upon that which darkens, upon every murmur of false criticism, upon every gesture of unjust dissent. Direct all citizens to turn and see the groaning and the travailing, the misery and the captivity endured by our own dear soldier boys—all to make our homes happy and free. Give our land a release from the confusion of tongues and to all eager, restless, doubting ones, let come the challenge of the ages, that in the restoration of this beaten world, America is in the hands of a good God to save the exiles and share its lofty mission with all who mourn. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 28, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint Resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were closed.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 146]

Andrews	Capozzoli	Fay
Baldwin, Md.	Carter	Feighan
Baldwin, N. Y.	Celler	Fenton
Barden	Chapman	Fernandez
Barry	Clark	Fish
Beall	Cooley	Fitzpatrick
Bell	Creal	Flannagan
Bender	Crosser	Ford
Bland	Cullen	Gale
Bloom	Curley	Gallagher
Bolton	Davis	Gamble
Bradley, Mich.	Dawson	Gavagan
Buckley	Delaney	Gerlach
Buffett	Dickstein	Gifford
Burch, Va.	Ditter	Gillette
Burchill, N. Y.	Domengeaux	Goodwin
Butler	Douglas	Graham
Byrne	Eberharter	Granger
Canfield	Ellis	Grant, Ala.
Cannon, Fla.	Ellison, Md.	Gregory

Gwynne	Kilburn	Randolph
Hall	Kleberg	Rizley
Leonard W.	Klein	Rogers, Calif.
Hare	Kunkel	Rogers, Mass.
Harness, Ind.	Lane	Satterfield
Hart	LeFevre	Scanlon
Hartley	Lesinski	Scott
Hebert	Lewis, Colo.	Shafer
Heffernan	Ludlow	Sheridan
Hendricks	McKenzie	Sikes
Hess	McMurray	Smith, W. Va.
Hill	Merritt	Snyder
Hinshaw	Michener	Somers, N. Y.
Hoffman	Miller, Pa.	Stefan
Holmes, Mass.	Morrison, La.	Stevenson
Jackson	Morrison, N. C.	Sumner, Ill.
Jennings	Myers	Sundstrom
Jensen	Newsome	Taylor
Johnson	Norton	Tibbott
Anton J.	O'Connor	Treadway
Johnson	O'Leary	Troutman
Calvin D.	O'Toole	Vincent, Ky.
Johnson	Peterson, Fla.	Wadsworth
Luther A.	Pfeifer	Welch, Ohio
Jones	Philbin	Weiss
Judd	Pittenger	Wene
Kearney	Plumley	West
Kee	Powers	Whichel, Ga.
Keefe	Pracht	Winter
Kelley	Rabaut	Wolfenden, Pa.
Keogh	Ramey	
Kerr	Ramspeck	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 281 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

REPRESENTATIVE EUGENE E. COX

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I never gave my heart and my hand to another in friendship but that they were his forever, and nothing has delighted me more than hazarding injury by going to his aid in time of stress. This sweet manner of receiving me with such gracious applause evidences to me that the Members of the House have this same devotion to this highest of human relationships.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a year, now, I have been the object of bitter and scurrilous attacks.

Day after day the poisoned shafts of slander have been driven through my heart. Every effort to tear down and to destroy a reputation I have spent a lifetime in building has been put forth. All this is something that I have been compelled to endure in silence. My hands have been tied—tied by the chairmanship of the select committee of this House to investigate the F. C. C.

This chairmanship has compelled me to maintain a judicial attitude which cannot longer be done in the face of the insults and the slander being hurled at me from day to day.

Mr. Speaker, that which is being dealt out to me is a sorry wage for a service I have tried to render in the interests of my fellow men.

It is a difficult thing—a terribly difficult thing—for a man to sit silent under the lashes of slander and falsehood such as have been laid upon me. But so long as silence appeared to be in the best interest of the operations of the select committee of which I am the chairman, it was the part of wisdom and good administration for me to do so.

The first consideration must be the integrity and effectiveness of the work

of the committee of which I am chairman. The utterly baseless personal attacks upon me have beclouded the real issue of whether the Federal Communications Commission has been guilty or not guilty of the acts of maladministration with which it has been charged, and which this committee was directed by the House to investigate. The House and the country are deeply concerned to ascertain the facts about the F. C. C. without prejudice, and free of personal controversies.

As long as I am connected with the investigation it is obvious that the effort will be made to divert public attention from the real issue of alleged maladministration of the affairs of the F. C. C. to a personal controversy.

In my judicial career when a case arose in which my own personality was involved or my impartiality was questioned, it was my practice to eliminate myself from the trial of the case. While such a custom does not prevail in investigations by legislative bodies, I have, nevertheless, reached the conclusion that in the light of the circumstances and the nature of the controversy in this instance, I may well follow that course.

The truth of this personal controversy and my complete vindication will come at another time and in another way. It cannot be attempted on this floor in the limited time I have at my command and this is not the time for such an effort.

I do want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I face my colleagues in the House—those who have known me and who have been my warm and cherished friends over the years—with an absolutely clear conscience. The work the committee has begun must be completed. The evils at which the inquiry is directed must be eradicated. Unless this is done, one of our most cherished freedoms will become but an empty phrase.

Mr. Speaker, this is a hard thing for a man to do. It is an unhappy thing for a man to have to do, and if my own interests alone were at issue I could not do it. But, Mr. Speaker, the first duty of every Member of this House is to consider the welfare and the effectiveness of the House itself. Its interests are incomparably greater than the interests—even the right of justice—attaching to any individual Member. The next duty of a Member of this body is the welfare of the various instrumentalities it creates to carry out its will—whether those instrumentalities be independent agencies or standing or select committees. Any Member who loves this body as we all love it, who takes pride and deep satisfaction in being a part of its honored membership, must put before himself, before his own interests, before even justice to himself, the best interests of the House. Consequently, the action I take today is based solely upon my conscientious and deep desire to live up to the most sacred obligations of this body and to my oath as a Member of it.

Mr. Speaker, moved by these considerations, and fortified by the concurrence of friends in this House in whose friendship and judgment I have the utmost

confidence, I tender you my resignation as chairman of the Select Committee to Investigate the Federal Communications Commission. Its work thus far has been well done. Its membership is excellent. Its staff is composed of men and women who are able, conscientious, and skilled in the work they have undertaken. This committee must continue its work under a new chairman, freed of any possible embarrassment of my personal problems or controversies. I thank you for the honor of having named me chairman of the committee, and for your expressed confidence in my administration of its affairs. I urge the House to support, to continue and to stand solidly back of the work of the committee under its new chairman, whoever he may be.

So far as I am personally concerned, my love and admiration for this House, my devotion to its ideals, make it a matter of pride with me that I, as one of its Members, efface myself so that the work of one of its committees may go forward. Let no man mistake me. I shall continue to make the fight where I find it. I leave the Well of this House today with my head unbowed and with my devotion to my duties undimmed.

The SPEAKER. The resignation of the gentleman from Georgia is accepted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement just made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] indicates his high courage and unselfishness. No enemy could have compelled him to relinquish his special committee assignment. Threats and vicious abuse would have been shrugged aside with disdain and contempt. Vilification and slander he has ignored. Yet, his nobility of character would not permit him to continue in a place that might cause embarrassment to the House, to his colleagues, and his friends. It is apparent to all of us that unselfishness and a high regard for the sensibilities of his colleagues in this House have been the only motives which prompted the gentleman from Georgia to follow the course that he has taken. The people of the district the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] so ably represents, I know are proud of his services. His unselfish act of today will make them feel prouder of him, and of his high and noble character, and of his courage.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMASON). Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleague in applauding the unselfishness of our colleague from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. He has the courage in a situation difficult to him personally to be big enough in mind and in heart to efface himself, and to leave a position because he thinks that the thing that is near to his heart may be jeopardized by his presence upon this special committee. And I say to this House,

after 20 years of intimate association with the gentleman from Georgia, GENE COX, during which he has had my friendship and my love and my confidence, that today that love and that confidence in his honor and in his integrity is unshaken.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the utterances of the Speaker of this House contribute one of the finest compliments that any Member of the House has ever received in the constitutional history of our country, or that any Member ever will receive in the future. The Speaker is the presiding officer of this body. The gentleman from Texas, Speaker RAYBURN possesses the confidence and respect of everybody, without regard to party. No fairer man has ever presided on the rostrum of this House than our present distinguished and beloved Speaker, and his words carry force and weight, not only in this body, but throughout the length and breadth of this country, because the people of this country have confidence in the gentleman from Texas, SAM RAYBURN, the Speaker of the National House of Representatives.

One of the elements of greatness is willingness to make sacrifices. Today we have witnessed one of the finest acts of sacrifice that has ever taken place, particularly in this chamber.

As to the honesty and integrity of our distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. Cox] there is no question. He is above reproach. Any attempt to besmear or besmirch his name will be defeated because it is impossible, no matter how cheap the efforts might be, to prevent the people of this country from knowing the truth on the question of the honesty of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. His honesty and integrity are clearly evidenced to the people of America by the splendid, spontaneous, and unanimous reception that he has received on this occasion.

I hesitate to proceed further and I will conclude by making this short statement. You and I, my colleagues, have today witnessed the greatest act of personal sacrifice that any man has ever made who has ever been a Member of this distinguished body. Great as he has been as a Member of this body in the past in the estimation of his colleagues and his friends, the gentleman from Georgia, EUGENE COX, has risen today to a greatness that impresses itself not only upon the Members of our body but of the people of the entire United States. He has made a great personal sacrifice in order that the integrity of this great body might be maintained in the minds and in the eyes of the American people. I know I express the thoughts and sentiments of every one of my colleagues when I convey to the gentleman from Georgia, EUGENE COX, our deep feelings of appreciation and our profound thanks for the great personal sacrifice he has made today.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign my membership on the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Very respectfully,

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.

The SPEAKER. With objection, the resignation is accepted.
There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk several resolutions and ask for their immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 309

Resolved, That EDWARD O. McCOWEN, of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Flood Control of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 310

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, to wit: HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr., of Pennsylvania, and CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 311

Resolved, That JAMES GALLAGHER, Sr., of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 312

Resolved, That ERRETT P. SCRIVNER, of Kansas, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and the Committee on Claims of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include certain editorials about the late editor of the New York Sun, Frank M. O'Brien.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ABRIDGING FREEDOM OF SPEECH BY RADIO OR WIRE COMMUNICATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House joint resolution to amend the Constitution. When that amendment is adopted, and I hope it is adopted in the very near future, it will be known as the twenty-second

amendment to the Constitution. It has to do with freedom of speech on the radio.

Radio has become such an important factor in the shaping up of public opinion that there has been a tendency by Government officials, broadcasting officials, and various organizations to impose a direct or indirect censorship on radio discussions. Such censorship is not in the interests of the development of a free American public opinion.

The American people are able to formulate their own judgments. They must have their information brought to them without interference from those who do not entertain the true value of the public mind, established by our successful history founded on the judgments of all Americans after free public debate on the numerous issues solved during the course of this country's life.

The more serious tendency toward censorship lies in the efforts to make our courts lean toward censorship restrictions on radio communications because broadcasting for physical reasons is necessarily subjected to a licensing or a franchise system.

There really should not be any question but that the provisions of the first and fourteenth amendments to the Constitution apply to radio. But, because of the tendency to differentiate speech through licensed communication from ordinary speech, as far as freedom is concerned, it has become imperative that Congress and the people speak more pointedly on this question through a referendum in the form of my proposed amendment.

I have purposely refrained from attaching directly new language to the first and fourteenth amendments because these two amendments are so sacred to the American people and now so succinctly express the basic American creed that any tampering with their form might be viewed as a profanation.

Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and a free press not only are the great objectives of our system but are, as well, the guaranties of its continuance.

Americans are not a namby-pamby people. They can take strong stuff over the air just as they can give strong medicine to our enemies on the field of battle. The forthright leaders of the past—those men who guided America to its present high position—were never mollicoddles in the use of language and there is no reason for the belief that leaders on the air today should pull their punches in castigating inimical movements.

If a speech on the air offends a listener, the dial can always be turned away from the broadcaster who is offending as far as a particular listener is concerned. We want our broadcasting to be forthright and we want our facts accurately reported. We will pass our own judgments.

At present, through a filter system, composed of the Federal Communications System and those who control the licensed broadcasting systems, our broadcasting has been diluted to the degree where it has become so neutral as to be ineffective. We want strong speech from strong men on the air, not synthetic un-

derstatements from pulpitiereing puppets. An example of the worth of strong free speech is in the broadcasts of Walter Winchell. He helped to awaken America to the danger of the fifth column and his sharp attacks on it over the air did much to destroy it. He aroused public opinion to such an extent that the work of the enemy in our midst has been ineffective. Censorship that would have stopped Winchell in these attacks would have been disastrous to the country.

There are other able commentators on the air who have fearlessly pointed out to the people things that were destructive and these men should not be hampered because higher-ups do not share their views or approve of their methods of expression.

America can only live while speech is free and the most important of all speech is speech by radio.

Following is a copy of my resolution:

House Joint Resolution 168

Joint resolution—Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech by radio or wire communication

Resolved, etc., That the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended by adding the following article:

AMENDMENT 22, SECTION 1. Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech by radio or wire communication.

SEC. 2. The provisions of any law, license, or contract in violation of section 1 hereof are hereby declared inoperative.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] at the dedication of a river terminal at Guntersville, Ala.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATIVE TO INVESTIGATION OF THE PROGRESS OF THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 716) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. No. 38) authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,500 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the first session of the

Seventy-eighth Congress on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein an article written by me and which appeared in the September issue of the Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests: First, that I may extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

THE GASOLINE SITUATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I know of no study made in reference to the gasoline situation that has found that there is not sufficient gasoline in the United States to take care of those individuals who must have it to carry on their lawful occupation.

A great many salesmen, a number of cream and poultry buyers and others are and will be forced out of business because of the recent cut in their gasoline rations. All of these individuals are carrying on a part of the important necessary work of our country. Some of these individuals are well along in years. They cannot go to the factory or the farm. They are just out of business.

To limit a salesman to 120 miles of travel a week might be all right in some territories, but out in the wide open spaces of our agricultural States, it is not enough. Is there any good reason why, after the military needs are met, the individual who must have gasoline to stay in business should not be taken care of next?

One traveling man has sent me the following letter, which, in my opinion, carries a great deal of truth:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: While the O. P. A., under orders, of course, from the New Deal, is starving traveling salesmen to death by cutting their gas to 120 miles a week, the World Herald, of Omaha, of this date, had on its sport page an item telling of the Lowry Field, of Denver, football team being taken to Fort Riley in six-count them—six bombers to play football there today. Why, they will use enough gas to run all the salesmen in Nebraska a week, if they were permitted enough gas to cover their entire territories. Of course, I am not mentioning anything at all about Eleanor wasting gas all over the face of the earth.

Among the salesmen and others who must have gasoline to carry on are found some of our finest citizens. They are paying taxes, buying bonds, giving their sons, husbands, and fathers to the armed services. They are not receiving the consideration that they should have in the rationing of gasoline. They have been discriminated against since gasoline rationing first began. Those officials who make the rules and regulations for gasoline rationing should get acquainted with the work that these men are doing, or somebody else should take their places.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that our salesmen and others who must travel can be given more gasoline.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Mr. George W. Vaught, notwithstanding the fact that it contains two and a half pages, and I am advised by the Government Printing Office that it will cost \$105.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.)

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a statement by the dairy industry of my State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include an article by former Ambassador William C. Bullitt, which appeared recently in the Polish Catholic Press Weekly Review.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include an article on the life and history of the Navy of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

(Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the other special orders heretofore entered I may address the House today for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MILITARY LEAVE

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in behalf of our soldiers who are not in position to have furloughs or leave.

I wish to point out that with members of the armed forces stationed all over the world some in training in this country, others on active fighting fronts, and still others in strategic locations which have not yet become combat areas, it is impossible for the Army and Navy to grant uniform leaves of absence or furloughs. Of necessity the decision of the commanding officer in the light of particular circumstances has to govern what, if any, leaves or furloughs can be granted. Accordingly, some members of the service might receive 30 days leave or furlough a year and others none at all.

It seems only fair that members of the armed forces who, because of the particular nature of their assignment are prohibited from taking leave, should at least receive compensation for the unused leave to which they are normally entitled. The accumulation of leave is directly conditioned upon length of service rendered. Under a bill I have today offered, the members of the armed forces upon discharge from service will be credited with accumulated leave and paid a lump sum payment in settlement of unused leave. It will represent an earned personal savings fund that will be available to the individual to use in any manner he or she may choose.

I wish to emphasize that in no way is this accumulated leave pay to be considered a part of or substitute for whatever general termination pay or benefits the Congress might decide should be given to members of the armed forces at the termination of the war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a soldier.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have received from Mr. N. V. Duncan, of Fairfield, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the officers of the Farmers' Union of Peake, Local No. 1541, of Pleasanton, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two short articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RATIONING AND THE WAR BOND CAMPAIGN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently and during the Third War Loan Drive, in Delaware County, in the Tenth Congressional District of Indiana, which I have the high honor to represent, the director and chairman of that war-loan drive found it necessary for members of his organization to drive automobiles over that county in making personal solicitation for bond sales, and this required gasoline in excess of the coupons which those solicitors had.

The local War Price and Ration Board was contacted in an effort to secure extra coupons for gasoline in order to effectively carry on this campaign for the sale of War bonds but this request was refused by that board.

Then, in a frantic effort to secure some extra gasoline coupons, for the purpose of completing the sale of War bonds in that county, the chairman and director of the drive made a request to the State director of the war price and rationing, and he, likewise, refused to grant this very reasonable request.

The good people of that county continued their efforts to sell Government

bonds by walking—many of them walking great distances to contact prospective purchasers—but they finally completed their quota, and sold all bonds allotted to that county. That is the spirit of the people in Indiana.

While the people in my district were walking and selling Government bonds to aid in the prosecution of this war, many bureaucrats in Washington, who will draw their wages and salaries from the very money those people were collecting in the sales they made of bonds, were riding in large automobiles, purchased by the Government, with an unlimited supply of gasoline, paid for and provided by the people of this Nation. This policy is entirely unfair, and these people will have something to say on this subject in the future.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REMOVE THE O. P. A. CEILING PRICE ON CORN

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution to remove the O. P. A. ceiling price of \$1.07 a bushel on corn, effective November 1, 1943, and let it seek its own level and open the road for the sale of middle western corn to the farmers in the Eastern States. Unless this is done immediately, there will be practically no corn for eastern poultrymen and dairymen, seriously affecting the production of these vital food commodities.

The poultry and dairy herds in the East cannot live on continued alibis, excuses, and promises of relief from the Federal Government. It must be obvious that there will be very little sale and shipment of corn from the Western States unless the ceiling price of \$1.07 is taken off and corn permitted to reach a level whereby it will be profitable for the growers in Iowa and other Middle Western States to sell to eastern farmers and industries.

The responsibility rests upon the Congress, now that the commitment made by Chester Davis, former War Food Administrator, that there would be no advance in the price of corn before October 31, 1943, is about to expire, to remedy this situation by legislative action. It would have, perhaps, been unfair to do so prior to that date, as a definite commitment had been made by the Department of Agriculture. But the Congress should now act immediately to remove the ceiling price as of November 1, and start corn moving to the East. We must have corn for our poultry, our dairy cows, and our industries, including vital war industries, now, and not 6 months from now.

The situation is critical, and unless Congress acts to afford immediate relief to the eastern farmers by providing them with corn and feed grains, many of them, particularly the poultrymen and dairymen, will be forced to either curb production or go out of business. The handling of the farm problem has been the greatest blunder and most colossal failure of all the New Deal experiments, and has all but wrecked and ruined our eastern farmers. What a tragedy it is, in view of the Government's urging the American people to raise poultry and then, when they have complied, corn is not available through New Deal blundering. The production of milk, butter, and eggs is rapidly falling off, and the supply of poultry will also next year. We are facing a food shortage which is becoming more acute every day, and it is the duty of the Congress to act now to prevent a more serious situation from developing.

The resolution I introduced today is as follows:

Joint resolution removing the ceiling price on corn

Resolved, etc., That the order placing a ceiling price on corn by the Office of Price Administration, at \$1.07 a bushel, is hereby removed, effective November 1, 1943. No ceiling price on corn shall be placed in effect by any agency of the Government without the consent of the Congress.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF OCTOBER 4

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell us what the program for next week will be?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no program for next week, and there will be nothing as far as I know except such matters as may come up by unanimous consent. Should anything arise unexpectedly I will see that the House is given sufficient notice, but I do not know of anything that will come up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman realizes that the Committee on Military Affairs is conducting hearings on the soldier allotment bills. May we expect such a bill to be reported at an early date?

Mr. McCORMACK. I see the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], a member of the committee, here. Perhaps he can tell us.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say that we started the hearings on yesterday and will probably conclude them tomorrow. I understood from the announcement of the chairman that the matter would then be referred to a subcommittee to complete the drafting of a bill, and we should finish it sometime next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And may we expect it to be brought to the floor at an early date?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman's views, and I know that the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] knows my views; we are in harmony.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate that fact.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think something should be done.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I appreciate the kindly cooperation of the majority leader in giving the green light to House Joint Resolution 155, which is now in the process of being whipped into shape and I should like to ask the majority leader if he will give us the same timely cooperation on the bill of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] that revives the stamp plan for furnishing food to the low-income groups in the hope of getting this through immediately to take care of those people who are being pinched by the increased cost of living.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be only too glad to look into it. It is difficult for me to resist the charm of my distinguished friend, but when he also includes the other distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] he makes it practically irresistible, but I will look into the matter gladly and cooperate to the extent I can.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader, with all his great ability and influence, may possibly persuade the Military Affairs Committee to look into the fact that a quarter of a million colored boys have been rejected by the Selective Service because they cannot read or write or because something might be the matter with their teeth or that they might have flat feet. If he did so, he might find a reservoir of manpower to put into our Army in the present emergency. Does the gentleman think he could use his influence to ascertain those facts so that we may have them at the proper time?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am positive, the gentleman having made his observations, that the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee will take cognizance of the fact and give it consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, my attention has been called to the fact that the calling of bills on the Consent Calendar is due for Monday. They will be called as usual?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I am glad the gentleman from Massachusetts has reminded me of that, as did the Parliamentarian. The bills on the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar will be called next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a short article from the Columbus (Miss.) Commercial Dispatch, containing a letter of Lt. J. D. Franks, Jr., who lost his life in the raid on the Rumanian oil fields.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE STATE OF THE NATION FROM A CONGRESSIONAL VIEWPOINT

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I believe I am safe in saying that the 10 years between 1933 and 1943 will go down in our history books as the "rubber-stamp era," because it was a decade high-lighted by a subservient Congress; it was a decade in which "must" legislation predominated; it was a decade when all important bills were tailor-made in the executive departments and sent to Congress for passage. Every piece of legislation and every power asked for by the President during those 10 years, with the exception of two, were granted him. Congress did not even take the trouble to scrutinize the language nor the scope of the legislation. As a result, much loose, vague, ambiguous legislation was passed.

The two refusals during this "rubber-stamp era" were the Supreme Court packing proposal and the scheme to reorganize the Government departments—a scheme to make the executive department of the Government supreme. Both of these proposals were defeated, as you know, because an aroused people made their fears and opposition felt through a barrage of letters and telegrams of protest. I credit the newspapers of the country for the job they did at that time in arousing the people to the dangers that threatened our form of government.

I know at first hand how discouraging and disappointing this "rubber-stamp era" was, because I had to live with it and take part in it. All my campaign speeches during this "rubber-stamp era" had for their theme, "We need men, not mice, in Congress."

Then came the election of 1942, in which many "rubber stamp" Congressmen were defeated and new men with backbone elected in their place. This gave the country an independent-minded Congress, a well-balanced Congress, a Congress that insures a healthy, desirable condition in the legislative halls of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, last December while home for the Christmas holidays, I was bold enough to predict what the new Congress would do. I said the Congress:

First. Would pass no more New Deal legislation.

Second. Would grant no additional powers to the Executive unless actually needed for war purposes.

Third. Would clarify and speed up the war effort.

Fourth. Would reduce or do away with all subsidies.

Fifth. Would see to it that all future legislation would be specific and definite so there could be no chance for misinterpretation.

Those predictions have become established facts. The rubber-stamp Congress of the 1933-43 decade became by the election of 1942 "The Rebellious Congress," and now it begins to look as though it might become "The Cooperative Congress," because today New Deal bureaucrats are on the way out in Washington as a result of the legislative rebellion of the last 6 months, and businessmen who believe in the American system of free enterprise are now being placed in responsible positions. Cooperation therefore between the executive branch and the legislative branch of the Government can become the order of the day. I sincerely hope it will.

LEGISLATIVE HIGHLIGHTS

Mr. Speaker, I have listed a few of the accomplishments of the "rebellious Congress," that I want to bring to your attention—perhaps I should call them legislative high lights:

(a) The repeal of the \$25,000 salary limitation edict of the President. That salary limitation has been a plank in the platform of the Communist Party of America during the last 10 years. It is now an avowed objective of the C. I. O. Such a provision limiting salaries had been expressly prohibited by the Congress when drafting the price-control bill. The President chose to disregard that prohibition when he issued his order. The edict was repealed by attaching a rider to the debt limitation bill in order to avoid a veto. The repeal of this edict was made an issue by Congress to discourage future arbitrary edicts not authorized by law.

(b) The Hobbs antiracketeering labor bill was passed in the House by a two-to-one vote. This measure was opposed by the White House, by the C. I. O., and by the A. F. of L. The passage of this bill was a real test of the independence of Congress, because in voting for it Members disregarded the greatest labor lobby ever mustered, paid no attention to their threats, nor did they give in to White House pressure. A two-to-one vote in the face of these things is something to write home about.

(c) Congress again proved its independence by the passage of the Smith-Connally antistrike bill over the President's veto in record time. As you know, the President has finally decided to make use of the provisions of that bill as a club to force John L. Lewis into line.

(d) Being economy-minded, this rebellious Congress liquidated four New Deal agencies, the National Resources Planning Board that had hatched out the cradle-to-grave security program, now dubbed "womb-to-tomb program"; the National Youth Administration, a special pet and protégé of Mrs. Roosevelt, with "parlor pinks," such as Aubrey Williams, at the head of it; the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation that provided crop insurance at taxpayers' expense, a program neither sound nor practical; and the Bituminous Coal Division of the Interior Department, a New Deal scheme to establish coal prices and costs of production.

(e) Congress also slashed appropriations for O. P. A. and made a drastic cut in O. W. I. appropriations, especially

its domestic propaganda branch. Besides that Congress pruned the Office of Civilian Defense, and many other New Deal useless expenditures. To be exact, this economy-minded rebellious Congress lopped off altogether \$1,000,000,000 from Uncle Sam's annual budget.

Summing up the record of the Congress for the last 6 months, I would say it has put quite a crimp in the New Deal, has reasserted its authority over the legislative processes, and has reestablished itself once again in the eyes of the people as an important arm of our Federal Government. Teamwork with the Executive is a very desirable thing, but subservience to him is something else again.

OUR TAX PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most constructive act of the new Congress was the passage of a pay-as-you-earn tax plan. A change in our method of collecting personal income taxes had become absolutely necessary because during the last 2 years Congress lowered the income-tax brackets so that instead of some 4,000,000 taxpayers filing returns and paying taxes we now have 44,000,000 taxpayers, most of whom know little about budgeting their expenditures, do not save ahead, and so must be placed upon a pay-as-you-earn basis. Uncle Sam, therefore, had to reach into the pay envelopes of these 40,000,000 new taxpayers in order to make certain of his tax money.

At this point I want to give you an idea of what to expect in the future tax picture. The Federal tax bill for 1943 will be about \$35,000,000,000, eight times the load it was when the New Deal took over. The administration now plans to make the tax load about fifty billions for 1944, an increase of one-third over the present load. As these are astronomical figures, a few comparisons might help.

Before the New Deal era the entire cost of the Federal Government ran around \$4,000,000,000 a year, and the interest on our public debt was about one-quarter billion dollars per year. Today the cost of the Federal Government is about \$8,000,000,000 per year, twice what it was, and the interest charge alone upon the public debt is two and one-quarter billion dollars, or nine times as much as it was in pre-New Deal days. At a conservative estimate, after the war is over the interest charges on our public debt will be over \$4,000,000,000 per year, more than the entire cost of running the Government 10 years ago.

Our total direct appropriations so far this session amount to \$115,000,000,000, which, when added to reappropriations and authorizations, make a total of about \$150,000,000,000 that Uncle Sam has available to spend during this fiscal year. Regular post-war appropriations are expected to top twenty-five billions a year. This amount will be needed to cover an enormous public works program, a greatly expanded social security program, and our enlarged national defense program. After the war is over it is proposed to appropriate \$5,000,000,000 per year for the Army and Navy, as against

a pre-war appropriation for the Army and Navy of less than \$1,000,000,000 per year. Anyone can readily see from these figures that our tax load will be a very heavy one for generations and generations to come. I need not tell you what a handicap that will be to business and industry.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. Speaker, I have just read a new book upon United States foreign policy by Walter Lippmann. It is written in newspaper style and expresses good sound common sense. It is well worth reading and studying. Because I agree quite thoroughly with Lippmann's thesis and arguments, I want to brief the book for you.

Lippmann says when we adopted the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, we assumed our first obligation or commitment to protect and preserve interests outside of our own boundaries. We undertook under the Monroe Doctrine to be the guardian and protector of the Western Hemisphere from Greenland on the north to the Straits of Magellan on the south. Because England had interests that paralleled ours in this hemisphere, she agreed to underwrite our commitment and become a cosigner of our obligation, pledging the use of her Navy to back up that obligation.

When we bought Alaska in 1867 we made quite an extended commitment in the Pacific—but did not take any steps to cover that commitment. We acted then, and we have been acting ever since, in much the same way that short-sighted people do who go to the bank and make financial obligations or commitments but never prepare to meet those financial obligations when they come due.

Then, in 1898, after the Spanish-American War, we took over Guam, Wake, and other Pacific Islands, and became responsible for the Philippines, taking over an obligation or commitment to protect lands 7,000 miles away, and we still did little or nothing to prepare ourselves to live up to that obligation, when and if it ever became necessary. Theodore Roosevelt was one man who realized the responsibility and seriousness of this commitment in the Pacific. He advocated a strong Navy and stretched his authority until it cracked in order to build the Panama Canal, trying to avoid the necessity of having to build a two-ocean Navy.

Mr. Speaker, after reading Lippmann's book, one is bound to agree that the interests of England and the United States in both the Atlantic and Pacific areas are complementary, are inseparable, are mutual, and parallel to each other. Also that the long chain of islands in the Pacific that we are obligated to protect and defend must be anchored upon bases in Asia—China, India, Australia, and the Dutch East Indies—to enable us to live up to our commitment. In this connection perhaps we should point out that our whole campaign against Japan today is being conducted, and necessarily so, from British and Dutch bases, and that we must recapture Rangoon and open up the Burma Road before we can

use China as a base for offensive operations against Japan. So, in view of the commitments in both oceans, that we have made voluntarily and with our eyes open, a realistic foreign policy for us must mean:

First. That we recognize and acknowledge the commitments and obligations we have assumed outside of the United States proper and prepare ourselves to cover those commitments;

Second. That we should make alliances with those nations whose interests are mutual and complementary; and

Third. That we make our armed forces, air, sea, and land, so strong that we can when necessary carry out our obligations whenever the same are challenged.

Until we do this our foreign policy will continue to be, as it has been since 1867, in a bankrupt condition, because we have never been prepared to live up to the obligations we have assumed.

POST-WAR FUTURE

Now, what about our post-war future? What may we expect in the post-war period? What can business expect? What can the farmer expect? What can industry expect? I frankly confess I do not know because I do not know who is going to plan that post-war future, nor do I know who will have the task of managing that post-war future. If new dealers such as WALLACE plan it and have charge of carrying out their plans, that will be one thing. If that happens we might then predict what to expect, because we are supposed to judge the future by the past, and the past 10 years under the New Deal show a definite trend toward national socialism.

Mr. Speaker, there are two schools of thought in Washington concerning our post-war future. The first is the socialistic school, headed by Frankfurter, Wallace, Judge Rosenman, Hopkins, Corcoran, Cohen, Henderson, and others. Their program is based upon Government control of all business and industry. This school of thought advocates a Government program of made work, another boondoggling era, to tide us over the slack period they expect after the war. They believe we should tax away all the profits of industry, renegotiate or cancel all war contracts, in order to get the money to pay for the proposed boondoggling program.

The other school of thought is headed by Jesse Jones, Byrnes, Vinson, Hull, and others. They believe we should preserve the American system of free enterprise, should look to and expect American industry to reconvert from wartime production to peacetime production with the least possible loss of time, and while doing so keep employment at a high level. This reconversion of industry would be made possible by reserves that industry had been permitted to build up during peacetime production for that very purpose. This school of thought bases its program upon a huge reservoir of consumer demand that has been dammed up during the war period; an immense purchasing power that will be accumulated as a result of high wages and forced sav-

ings to implement that consumer demand; and adequate industrial reserves that should be allowed to accumulate, large enough to tide over the industrial reconversion period. At least 98 percent of the Republican Members of both House and the Senate belong to this second school of thought and are supporting its post-war program.

I was very much encouraged when I read that the executive council of the A. F. of L. went on record recently at a meeting in Chicago in favor of this second view of our post-war program and against another boondoggling era. The executive council declared that private industry when the war is over must provide the jobs to take care of the returning soldiers, and must also be ready to give peacetime jobs to the millions now engaged in wartime work. The council was equally insistent that capital be encouraged to make possible industrial expansion. In expressing this view it used these very significant words:

The Government should not only permit but it should stimulate opportunities to make a reasonable and fair profit for business firms that are willing to increase production and employment. These business firms must be given assurances that they will not be taxed to death.

Mr. Speaker, when American business and American labor team up and insist that the Government should encourage and not discourage business expansion; that the Government should permit a fair profit to capital, and that the Government must not tax business to death, then the post-war outlook can be considered encouraging indeed. The executive council of the A. F. of L. is to be congratulated upon its constructive pronouncement covering the post-war future.

Summarizing, I have tried to give you a bird's-eye picture of the state of the Nation from a congressional viewpoint. I want to close by repeating and by re-emphasizing my slogan during the last four national campaigns and by recommending that slogan to Members on both sides of the aisle for use in next year's campaign, "We need men, not mice, in Congress."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman in his opening remarks referred to the fact that in the past 6 or 8 months the Congress has given evidence of a greater independence than it has in the previous 10 years. I wonder if the gentleman will agree that the reason the Congress has become independent is that there are 40 or 50 more Republican Members in this Congress than there were in the Congresses of previous years, so that the balance of power between the minority and majority party hangs by the small number of between 10 and 15.

Mr. MASON. Yes; I think I would agree with that. That has brought about a well-balanced situation here which, of course, helps materially. I also wish to say that I have noticed many more signs of independence on the right side of the

aisle during the last 6 or 7 months than I noticed in the 6 previous years that I sat in this Chamber.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman agree that if the public of this country want the Congress to be still more independent than it is even now they should send here about 50 more Republican Congressmen?

Mr. MASON. I hesitate right there because I want at this point to reiterate and emphasize the slogan I have used in the last four national campaigns, and I appealed to both Democrats and Republicans: "We need more men and fewer mice in Congress." You can take that on both sides of the aisle if you want to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Just one more question, and this is more in the nature of a correction. When the gentleman referred to the fact that as a result of the Spanish-American War this country acquired certain islands in the Pacific, he included the Hawaiian Islands. I am sure he did not intend that.

Mr. MASON. No; they were annexed before that.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman has emphasized the importance of private industry being permitted to retain part of its income, to lay something by.

Mr. MASON. To accumulate reserves.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Can that be accomplished under the policies we have been pursuing for a number of years?

Mr. MASON. It cannot. That can be accomplished only by changing the policies we have been pursuing for at least 10 years.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman recalls that only a few years ago we amended our Revenue Act and compelled private businesses to dispose of their surplus. If they did not, they were penalized heavily.

Mr. MASON. That is where we made our mistake. We are now making the same mistake when we force renegotiation upon most of the industries of the country, when only three or four are guilty and need it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman says "We." Of course, he means the majority.

Mr. MASON. I mean the party in power.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman means the party in power, because I did not vote for any such measure, to penalize private industry for undertaking to build up a reserve to protect itself and protect the jobs of its employees.

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. At the opening of the gentleman's splendid statement he referred to the Congresses of the past 10 years as being rubber-stamp Congresses.

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I wish the gentleman would make it clear that there was a minority that opposed that rubber stamping, even though the minority was small at times. The entire Membership of the Congress should not be condemned. The gentleman should put the blame where it belongs for yielding legislative and constitutional authority to the Executive.

Mr. MASON. When I made that statement I was not distinguishing as between the majority and minority parties. I said that as a whole it was a rubber-stamp Congress. Now I think it is a rebellious Congress, on both sides of the aisle. It is because of the work of this rebellious Congress that the New Deal autocrats and bureaucrats are on their way out and businessmen are being placed in positions of power who believe in preserving the American system of free enterprise.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I hope that demonstrates that the work of the minority for the past 10 years has finally had its effect upon a majority of the citizens of the country.

Mr. MASON. I think that is probably true. I would say that the work of the majority has become more effective now that we have a pretty well-balanced Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman referred to the air bases in other countries of the world. We note with a great deal of interest that a group of Senators has visited these bases. I do not notice a similar group from the House going around to see the various bases where we are spending millions of dollars to help in the war effort, to find out what is going to be done. I think we should have a committee from the House, from the Committee on Naval Affairs and from the Committee on Military Affairs, go around to see where we are spending our money and what is being done with it.

It seems that when a group of Senators or Representatives goes to the battle fronts of the world they are criticized, but on the other hand certain columnists and news commentators and others use Government airplanes and hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of dollars are being spent to transport them back and forth and dine and wine them and give them material for their columns and broadcasts. Does not the gentleman believe that in preference to financing these people to visit the battle fronts of the world we ought to send some of our responsible committees over there to bring back the information to us, so that we could take some part in shaping the post-war policy?

Mr. MASON. Personally, I am willing to accept the information the group of Senators brought back if the sample I saw in this morning's paper is a good sample of the information they have brought back. I approve wholeheartedly, and I for once am convinced without seeing.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. DEWEY. I have been very much interested in the gentleman's remarks

in regard to the post-war effort. I wonder if the gentleman has given consideration to the possible necessity of the overhauling of our income-tax laws, as they regard risk capital? This country of ours was built up by people willing to take a risk, but today, under the Internal Revenue laws, anybody who takes a risk, if he gains, all his gain is taxed from him, and if he loses, there is no compensation. I think that in the future when peace comes, the committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate should give consideration to the taxes on risk capital. We have here today over \$65,000,000,000 of savings in one form or another in the hands of the people, and I think if they will go out and help develop new industries it will put many men to work and give employment to our returning soldiers.

Mr. MASON. I agree, but I insist that the only way to do that is to support that second school of thought that I discussed so briefly.

Mr. DEWEY. I am in hearty accord with the gentleman.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. In the gentleman's opening remarks he spoke something concerning the amount of money that has been appropriated, and that had not been expended, but remained to be reappropriated, and said that it amounted totally to some \$150,000,000,000.

Mr. MASON. That is correct.

Mr. ROWE. There being approximately \$35,000,000,000 left in last year's fiscal appropriations for reappropriation. Does the gentleman believe it is humanly possible for this administration to expend that amount of money in a year?

Mr. MASON. Do I understand the question to be whether or not I believe it is humanly possible for this administration to spend \$150,000,000,000 this year?

Mr. ROWE. Yes.

Mr. MASON. I would say yes, judging the future by the past. They have spent about \$100,000,000,000 this year, and they are just getting started. It ought to be very easy for them to increase the amount by \$50,000,000,000, providing WALLACE and his kind have the handling of it.

Mr. ROWE. One other question. Being a new Member of Congress, sometimes I have been a little nonplussed that we approach many serious problems, but seem to be bereft of pertinent information respecting them, and I think I heard our colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] remark something about specialists being employed by this Congress to give proper information so that it may be available for us with which to approach this question of spending money more intelligently in the future than in the past. Does the gentleman believe, as an older Member of this body, that such a body of experts should be available to the House?

Mr. MASON. I certainly do, and I think this body has been remiss in the

past in not insisting on that; I think at least 10 or 15 years ago, when our budget sprung above \$5,000,000,000.

Mr. ROWE. Does the gentleman think they would contribute in some degree to the solution of the query just raised by another Member about the expenditure of money for persons dissociated from the Government to travel over the face of the earth, spending money for purposes I am sure this Congress never intended it to be spent?

Mr. MASON. I agree to that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] I think refers to the House concurrent resolution that I introduced earlier, to create a joint House and Senate committee for efficiency in expenditures. I think about 5,000 copies of that resolution have been produced over the country thus far, but we have not been able to get any action by the Rules Committee. It does bring up this collateral thought. We have been so apt to accept so many of the things that are brought before us by the bureaus of the governmental agencies and nowhere is that quite so true as it is in respect to military expenditures. For instance, if the Quartermaster General says that we have to buy 65,000,000 pairs of socks, we act upon the theory that he actually needs 65,000,000 pairs of socks, and that the money should be appropriated with which to buy them. I believe the time has come for this Congress not only to scrutinize the expenditures on the home front, but the military and naval expenditures as well, because the Truman committee aptly indicated that some money could be saved in that direction. It would give, I think, enormous aid in the necessity for amortizing at some time in the future the huge service charge that will amount to \$5,000,000,000 on the basis of current interest rates, and we have to put our shoulders to the wheel of economy and efficiency on every front, if we are going to save this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PROPAGANDA HAS NO PLACE IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I propose to speak on the subject that political propaganda has no place in our public schools. I wish to refer in that connection to a publication entitled "My Part in This War," on which subject I spoke some time ago.

Mr. Speaker, on the 17th day of May 1943 it was my privilege to address the House on the important subject Propaganda Has No Place in Our Public Schools, and it appears the effort to distribute propaganda in our schools is still continuing. The booklet which was published by the Consumer Education Study, which is apparently a branch of

the National Association of Secondary School Principals, a department of the National Education Association, with offices at 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., under the title of "My Part in This War," is creating much comment among the teachers and school men and women throughout the country.

The title of this publication, My Part in This War, is very attractive, because every American has a part in this war; yet the contents of this publication should be carefully scrutinized and analyzed in order to get the full import of its meaning and purpose.

Mr. Speaker, quite recently I have been informed that Mr. Thomas H. Briggs, who purports to be a director of consumer education study, made a statement that at the time I spoke on this subject it was before I had seen and inspected this booklet, My Part in This War. I hereby refute that statement made by Mr. Briggs. At the very time I spoke on this subject in the House of Representatives I had one of these books in my possession, and when I spoke I had with me a copy of such book, which I showed to the Members of the House during my discourse. Prior to the time I spoke on that subject, I desire to enlighten that gentleman by saying I had carefully studied this propaganda booklet, and I copied extracts from it, which parts were used in my address at that time. I was fully advised and I knew whereof I was speaking when I addressed myself to this subject. The copy of this much-publicized booklet which I then had possession of, and which copy I still retain, was purchased by me from the National Education Association, at its office, at 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Would the gentleman enlighten the House as to whether or not this National Education Association is a private association or is it financed by the Government, or whether it has any connection with the Government?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not know whether it is financed by the Government or not. I know that Mr. Thomas H. Briggs, who is a part of it, has been connected with the Government, and to that extent, at least, he has participated in the publication of this booklet, as you will observe as I proceed further in this discourse, and a Mr. Marcus Rosenblum, of the O. P. A., rewrote the manuscript, according to a statement which is contained in this book.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield for a clarification?

Mr. SPRINGER. I shall be happy to yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The National Education Association is chartered by Congress. It has nothing to do with the administration or the Government but is supported by contributions from teachers all over the United States, as members of the association.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is exactly what I knew and I wanted the RECORD to show that it is not a Government organization.

Mr. SPRINGER. Thanks for those contributions. However, Mr. Rosenblum, of the O. P. A., had his part in the preparation of this publication. Now, may I proceed with my statement?

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I must report that this organization, or group, or some one of them, still persists in its efforts to place this booklet in our public schools as a textbook. In my own State of Indiana, many efforts have been made to place this book, *My Part in This War*, in our public schools as a textbook. The success of this effort is unknown to me, but I have received letters from school men and women entirely disapproving of this book as a textbook in our public schools. They rejected it because it was filled with propaganda on controversial political issues, which they deemed improper for dissemination among the boys and girls in our public schools. The book is especially prepared for use in our schools, because instructions are set forth in it to the teachers, and many questions have been prepared for the students, of which the following are but a few:

What new courses are being offered to your school as a result of the war?

How has your school contributed to the war effort besides by revising its curriculum? Survey the war-time activities of your teachers.

Many other like, and similar questions, are propounded which leaves no doubt in our minds regarding its ultimate purpose. It is intended as a textbook in our public schools, and this fact is causing great concern among our people.

The question naturally comes, Why should the people be concerned about this publication?

After making a careful study of this book, the method of presenting the propaganda therein contained and the cunning method of establishing a definite conclusion is completely revealed. The most lasting impression on the mind is created during the formative age of youth, and these are apt to become the definite conclusion of the adult. Are we to sit idly by and permit future national policies and economic philosophies to be planted in the minds of our school children? Should we permit a resort to the methods of exploitation contained in *Mein Kampf* in this country? Will we permit the curriculum in our public schools to include political propaganda? Remember, if we stand by and permit this character of propaganda to be spread through our public schools we may be lending our aid to a complete change of our standards, to a reorganization of our domestic economy and even to a change of our form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced our people are not ready to abandon our American way of life. However, if we fail to counteract this character of propaganda the time may come when we will find ourselves helpless to prevent such a change.

Let me refer to a few of the pertinent paragraphs of this propaganda, which are contained in this book, *My Part in This War*.

I praise the F. S. A., which is a very controversial issue of political character.

There is contained in it an article wherein grade labeling is urged. This is another highly controversial issue, and one which is recognized as political in nature.

It refers to the collection of taxes and it pays particular attention to the pay-as-you-go plan, by negative suggestion, and concludes with this statement:

Perhaps the most important consideration to think about in regard to such a proposal is that it must not be used as a means of decreasing the total taxes to be paid.

We well remember some of the arguments presented on the tax bill, recently passed.

The frequently proposed spending tax is extolled by the writers of this book.

This propaganda production also speaks of strikes in wartime, stating they are not bad, it advocates against the enactment of a sales tax, it denounces the Ruml plan as being wrong, and it states that the President's directive fixing the top salary ceiling is still the law regardless of the action of Congress.

Some of the most pertinent questions contained in this book may be found on page 89, question 8, which are addressed to the school children, and are as follows:

What effect do the President's messages and statements have upon the people?

What is your personal reaction to them?

Many other controversial issues are presented in this book—many of which are issues presented by the New Deal.

The Indianapolis Times, one of the outstanding newspapers in Indiana, says:

There is some doubt as to how much the National Education Association actually had to do with the preparation of this booklet, since it appears under the imprint of a subdivision of a subdivision of that organization. There is a clear trace of Columbia University Teachers College, noted stronghold of leftist educational theory, across its background.

While there is no objection to a private organization distributing such booklets, if it so elects, there is every reason to object to the preparation of such a publication by a Federal agency, or by Federal employees, at public expense for a private group in time of war; and there is certainly a most serious objection against the distribution and use of this publication as a textbook in our public schools.

The foreword of this booklet makes the following statement:

In this crisis education as usual is no more justifiable than business as usual.

Can anyone deny the charge of propaganda in the face of that positive statement?

During the period of an all-out war effort we know that education suffers. The normal processes of education, business, and agriculture suffer. Yet, although education suffers now, that is no just reason for the distribution of vicious and intriguing propaganda among our boys and girls in the formative period of their lives to chart their trend of thought for the future years.

Mr. Speaker, our school children should be taught the fundamentals of government, together with a rigid course

or our Constitution, with the other usual subjects pertinent to their course of study. This should continue throughout their proper grades in the public schools. These boys and girls will only too soon be called upon to assume the responsibility of guiding the Nation. They will then determine those policies which will chart the course which will guide our destinies. They are the very ones in whom there should be instilled the concepts of government that their forefathers created, builded upon, and fought to protect and preserve. The school children of today must continue to be taught that the American way of life is soundly based on a government of the people, by the people and for the people, that our Government is a system of checks and balances, divided into three coordinate branches—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—that one cannot function without the support of the others, and, most of all, that if one is permitted to become paramount and independent of the others, democracy is dead.

Mr. Speaker, wartime economy is transient. It is like the shifting sand. If and when the individual liberties must be temporarily surrendered in time of war they must be recaptured and returned when peace comes. All wartime policies must be only temporary. Otherwise they will become a permanent national policy and economy under which our liberty and freedom will be lost forever.

While education must continue in time of war, just as in time of peace, yet there must be no substitute promulgated and no far-flung leftist idealisms promoted in our public-school system under the guise of war necessity.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our public schools must not be permitted to degenerate by turning them into propaganda agencies, regardless of the position taken on any controversial political issue by any group, organization, or governmental agency.

In the end, the people will stop this present policy, I am certain. The parents of the school boys and girls will not hesitate to urge all school authorities to critically scrutinize this and all other questionable publications offered as textbooks for use in our schools. They will question any proposed propaganda publication offered as a textbook, no matter where published, or by whom published. The theory of any group attempting to place before the youth of our land, through the medium of our public schools, any kind of controversial political propaganda is unthinkable and unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, the people expect the full and complete cooperation of their Government in placing our public schools upon a high plane—far higher than that exemplified by the sinister propaganda contained in the book *My Part in This War*—and they expect their Government to aid in stopping all attempts to disrupt the normal processes in our public schools by injecting vicious propaganda therein by placing unfit textbooks before the American youth.

Our schools must be kept free from politics.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the gentleman from Indiana is entitled to the thanks of the House for exposing to the curative light of day this propaganda sheet which might affect adversely our common-school system. I wish to compliment him for his timely utterances on this very important subject.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to thank my friend for that fine observation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPRINGER. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. For the information of the gentleman, let me say that in my congressional district in the city of St. Louis there are several very large high schools. They discuss political questions every week in the auditorium. They have debates upon issues that are before the public at the time. Further than that, when the national campaign is on they discuss the issues in the campaign, the platforms, and the candidates, and in the week before the election they have an unofficial election and they vote for President, Senator, Congressman, and Governor. I might say they are extremely intelligent, because in the last election the vote that those children cast, something over 2,000 of them, the result was reflected by the vote that was cast on the following Tuesday. I might say further they were intelligent because they gave me a great majority over my Republican opponent, and I was elected by a great majority over my Republican opponent.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to my distinguished friend from Missouri that it is all right for the children to debate those questions, but when you take a textbook and teach them one side of an issue, that is part of their education; they get only one side of the issue and that is all they know when they are presented with a text book, such as this one which I hold in my hand.

Mr. COCHRAN. Upon that I fully agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. That policy should not be permitted in our public schools, under any guise or pretense whatsoever.

Mr. COCHRAN. I fully agree with the gentleman. I might further say that I urged upon the principal that whenever they did have a debate or whenever they had anyone come to address the children, that they have people to address them on both sides of the question pending.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct in that position. That is the only way a political matter should be handled in our public schools. All of us disapprove of the program of teaching our school children but one side of a political issue in our public schools.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If I understand, this book is a textbook?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And they are forced to study that textbook and the teachers are forced to teach that textbook, and that presents just one side of the question?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. They get but one side of the political question, and they would have presented to them, by way of a textbook, that plan which is presented by the publication to which I now refer. This, in my humble opinion, is most vicious propaganda imaginable. This book should not be permitted to be used as a textbook in our public schools.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of all other business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FOUR MAJOR TASKS BEFORE THE COUNTRY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is good to see such a large and enthusiastic attendance in the Chamber this afternoon and I am going to suggest to my colleagues that they move over into the mourners' benches where we can enjoy this fellowship with the least amount of physical exertion.

I am deeply grateful to you. I want to visit a little while about a number of things. I want to go back to the general things that I discussed with my people this summer. It was a good, arduous sojourn back home, and there were many, many meetings every day. I presented to them this kind of an outline: I said we had four major tasks before the country. The first one was to win the war. The second was to win the peace. The third major task was to embark upon an immediate program for the preparation of the post-war period, when probably 10,000,000 in the armed forces will be demobilized and when perhaps 20,000,000 in the defense plants of the country will have to find other creative employment. The next major proposal that I discussed with people this summer was the salvation and the preservation of freedom in our own country.

You know that sounds a little academic, but it is not so academic after all, and certainly the boys in the armed services are beginning to exhibit some anxiety and concern about it.

I had a letter recently from a lieutenant colonel in Africa. He had been

in the big show. He wrote rather informally. He said:

We are hearing so many stories from back home about the rise of bureaucracy, about the invasion of the freedom of the people.

He said:

Is that the thing we are coming back to after arduous foreign service in the armed forces of our country?

And so it is a problem with which we are going to have to be concerned. I felt a little distressed about an hour ago when an inquiry was addressed to the majority leader as to what the program will be next week and the answer is that there is no legislative program for next week. I reaffirm what I said earlier this week when I asked why they got us back on the 15th of September if we are going to do nothing. We had just as well make up our minds after all that there is a job to be done and the people expect us to do the job; that we had better shuck off this inertia, we had better slough off this lack of diligence in the public business, if we want to call it that, and get down to brass tacks and start addressing ourselves with vigor to the major problems that are on the American horizon today.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. That strikes me as rather perplexing in that I have heard not only the Speaker, who is now in the Well of the House, but many other Members who are in this body, when asked what is before us and the answers are that we have nothing. The question I want to pose is this: Who does the initiating of action—and is the progress of this body dependent upon someone who can dam away some of our rights?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to my good friend from Ohio that I cannot very well comment on that, of course, but I can say for myself as a Member of this body, enjoying the same prerogatives as every other Member, that if there is no program I propose to make the best kind of program I can for myself, notwithstanding the fact that I may fail in so doing. And I will come back to that in just a moment.

I want to go back to this whole question of freedom and to show how necessary it is for us to be diligent and energetic about it right now. When I come from my office every day my eyes unconsciously go to the top of the Capitol on which there stands that lady we know as Freedom. She is a little unlike any other lady you and I have ever seen. She is inanimate. She is different from most ladies we see because she weighs 7 tons. She was placed there the second of December 1863.

I presume she was already in place when Abraham Lincoln was standing on the knoll at Gettysburg on the 19th of November, just 2 weeks before Miss Freedom was dedicated, and she could hear him say, by implication at least, what he did say at Gettysburg when he posed the question which has been going

up and down the corridors of time ever since, when he asked whether a Nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure; "whether a Nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are equal can long endure." That was the text of his eternal challenge.

Now then, for me, freedom is always synonymous with a responsible devotion to the government that was laid out by freedom such a long time ago; a Government consisting of three branches.

There was one branch to which those wise men, with great vision, gave the power of the sword; to another branch they gave the power over the purse, and to the third branch they gave the judicial authority to hear and to determine controversies. To the executive the power of the sword; the legislative with the purse, and the power to the judiciary to repel any invasion of the rights of the people. On that broad structure and basic foundation have the freedoms that made this country the greatest country on the face of the earth rested. Those wise men who gave us this form of government had a lot of experience behind them. They knew that their judges were dependent long ago upon the will of a king.

They noted that judges in King's Bench Court or in Queen's Bench, as they used to term it in English legal history, held their offices too long by sufferance of the sovereign and they got their pay only through the will of the sovereign. Knowing that, they made our judiciary quite independent. They said the judicial power shall be reposed in a supreme court and such inferior courts as Congress shall create; but they went further than that. They said: "Judges shall hold office for life conditioned on good behavior." They went further. They said: "Their salaries shall not be diminished during their continuation in office." That whole framework of our judicial system emanated from the fact that they saw how judges were influenced and were dependent upon the will of the king, and they wanted to create an independent judiciary that would hear controversies of law and fact between individual and individual, between the country or the sovereign and the individual, and so stand there as a great sentinel of the basic freedoms. Jefferson recognized it.

This morning I looked at a great facsimile of the Declaration of Independence, and there in the list of grievances he pointed out just that thing, that the judges were dependent upon the will of the sovereign; so they gave us a three-branch government which is the very essence of the freedom that we enjoy. What has happened to this three-branch government?

We have certainly been at fault in our duty in this body in bargaining away the independence of the judiciary. Go back and look at section 204 (d) of the Price Control Act. It was enacted by this body, it was enacted by the Senate, it went through conference and was signed by the President and then went out through the country:

No State, Federal, or Territorial court except the special emergency Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction of any question that relates to a price regulation or to a price schedule.

This very solemn body of which you and I are Members put that on the law books. Is it any wonder then that a three-man court in Peoria consisting of two former Members of this House and one other should, after they heard an appeal for a restraining order against the O. P. A., state to all the world:

This is but the culmination of a long series of acts by the Congress which have deprived the Federal courts of their jurisdiction.

A rather amazing thing.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Briefly.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman intend to have the RECORD indicate that all the Members of this body approved that section of the Price Control Act?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If they voted for it, they approved it.

Mr. CURTIS. Many of us, of course, did not vote for the act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well, that makes an exception for those Members.

Mr. CURTIS. I did not vote for that act, but even some of our colleagues who may have accepted price control as a necessity may have been—

Mr. DIRKSEN. May have accepted it, I take it, as a necessary evil?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is that the damage was done, and the thing I allude to is that that is but one of a number of acts through which we have impaired the power of the judiciary and the independence of the judiciary as one of the bulwarks of freedom in this country.

Mr. CURTIS. I will try to be brief if I may ask one more question along that line.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. We also placed in the act a prohibition against changing the course of doing business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is right.

Mr. CURTIS. That was called to the attention of certain O. P. A. officials not long ago; they smiled and said: "We do not proceed under the Price Control Act; we proceed under directives from the President."

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. What difference does it make what we put in the law if no bureaus have any respect for it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We shall see. It does make some difference what we put into the law about the judiciary, because if any citizen had been able to get a hearing in that court and could have gotten approval of a restraining order that would have put an end to that kind of business on the part of O. P. A. I discussed this matter the other day. The thing I want to emphasize here and now is that we are not wholly clean in the matter of impairing the authority of the judiciary in restraining the bureaucracy that treads upon the sacred rights of the people. That is No. 1. The other

thing I want to allude to is this: The executive branch is now doing by indirection, it would seem, what long ago used to be done by a species of polite intimidation. Do you remember in 1937 when the celebrated Court-packing matter was being ventilated in the Senate? I remember people writing me with stubby pencils on pieces of wrapping paper: "Dear Mr. DIRKSEN, do not let them pack the Court." In some instances they could hardly spell, and yet there had been drilled into them a great and sacred respect for the institutions of the country which made this a great country.

So the Court-packing scheme came along in 1937. It failed because of the great reverence that was drilled into the people in the little old red schoolhouses of long ago.

But now what is happening? How many Federal judges are today in the executive branch of the Government? How many have been taken from the Supreme Court of the United States? How many have been taken from the special courts right here in Washington, D. C.? Only one so far as I know has actually resigned his position, and that is Justice Byrnes. I notice that the others are on leave. And when this business is over what happens? They go back to the Federal bench from the executive branch.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Judge Vinson resigned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not notice that he resigned. He is carried in the May 1943 edition of the Congressional Directory as still being on the court.

Mr. PATMAN. He was required to. The others are not required to resign because they are members of statutory courts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have looked as nearly I could for the record. There are some on leave from the judiciary working in the executive branch and they will go back.

Will they disqualify themselves when they go back on the bench to pass on matters that came before them when they were a member of the executive branch of the Government? It is rather singular, is it not? While we have been impairing the jurisdiction of the courts, members are being taken from the benches of the country, their ability duly appraised, and asked to handle jobs of major import in the executive branch.

I am wondering how long that is going to continue and if they are going to preserve their places on the Federal benches of the country. I allude to that because you see here we begin to make little assaults upon the independence of the three branches of government that were set up in this structure long ago and that still constitute, I think, the best guarantee of a continued freedom in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield my 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 20 additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman is referring to what will happen if these judges go back to their own courts. The gentleman is no doubt familiar with a situation which is represented by legislation now pending in the Judiciary Committee where our Supreme Court has been by Presidential appointment so thoroughly packed with former Federal administrators that there is grave danger that the Court will not have a quorum qualified to sit, a majority of the Court in many cases being disqualified to sit because they are passing on acts in which they took part as administrators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is correct. How serious is all this? It is pretty serious. The other day when I made some observations on this floor, my friend from Texas for whom I have a genuine affection and whose high ability as a public servant I recognize, took time to follow me and to say that if the proposal I made to discharge the committee considering the Wolcott bill so that we can restore jurisdiction to the Federal courts should prevail, it would kill the O. P. A. That, as anyone knows, is an obvious exaggeration and overstatement.

Here is what he said:

If you were to pass a price-control bill and then allow any Federal judge in the United States to restrain price control, you would always have an injunction against price control. You would not have price control at all. You know, we have Federal judges of different faiths and beliefs and they have their hates and their prejudices.

He has no faith in the Federal judiciary of the country. He wants to put it all in this emergency court of appeals and keep it there. They have done most of their business in Washington and they have not been accessible to the litigants, rich and poor in the country, as Mr. Ginsburg told the Banking and Currency Committee when the price-control bill was before that committee in 1941.

So my friend from Texas, who is a very able lawyer and one of the most astute Members of this House, says it would not do to put this jurisdiction in the Federal courts of the country. I would never make that confession on this floor. If I am going to confess that I have no faith in the Federal judges of the country, a good many of whom have been appointed by the leader of his own party, then I would confess my lack of faith in our democratic processes and say that they are about to dismember the very integrity and sanctity of this great institution known as our Republic. You might as well then give it back to the Indians. It is a rather singular thing.

When an able lawyer like the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] says that it would not do to intrust this power to the Federal judges of the country, what happens to our faith in the judiciary and the three branches of government as contemplated by the framers of the Constitution? I say I am alarmed about

it, for when the courts are divested of jurisdiction and the citizen can no longer go to an accessible, untrammelled judiciary for a redress of his grievances, the power of bureaus and administrative agencies will be complete and the disintegration of the Republic is well under way.

Let me give you a quotation that appeared in this morning's paper, and this comes from the State of our distinguished friend, namely, the State of Texas. They had some abuse down there in connection with gasoline coupons. One of the O. P. A. hearing administrators went down to hold a hearing. What did he do? Was he content to find the operator of this filling station guilty and fine him? Oh, indeed not. Was he content to discipline or to admonish him? Oh, indeed not. He went infinitely further. He decreed that they had to go out of business.

So they appealed. To what instrumentality in the country? They appealed in this particular case to a Federal judge, because it is one of the few remaining things that you can still bring before a judge under O. P. A. That judge's name is Atwell. Here is what Judge Atwell had to say about this O. P. A. administrator, since it was an administrative hearing:

The hearing administrator, unknown to and unprovided for by Congress, presumes to conduct a court.

That is evidently all right with the gentleman from Texas, because he believes in O. P. A. just as it is, and that it is getting along all right with this special Emergency Court of Appeals. The Federal judge goes on further and says:

He acts without fear of consequence for his malfeasance or misfeasance. If he can suspend for 2 weeks, he can suspend for 2 years. He is not only unknown to the Congress but he is unknown to the Constitution. What the hearing administrator thinks is beyond the reach of Executive forgiveness. He himself is beyond reach of any constitutional removing group. He is a modern instance of pure dictatorship.

That was by a judge in the great Lone Star State of Texas, a very substantial portion of which is so ably represented by the gentleman from Texarkana. If it is all right for a Federal judge to pass on controversies involving violations of O. P. A. regulations, why should he not also have authority to pass on regulations which threaten the very life and existence of a citizen's business and livelihood?

You wonder when these things come to light as to what is going to happen to freedom in this country. When these administrators issue rules and regulations and somehow we abet their actions by making it impossible for people to get into an accessible Federal court, and then a great many of our judges are then merged in the executive branch, having not even resigned their positions on the judiciary, what happens to the pillars of the Constitution about which Webster so ably and so eloquently declaimed long ago?

So I am concerned about freedom as one of the great major problems before the country, even as it is now seeping into the consciousness of the boys who

are in the armed services and who write back to their Congressmen, their friends, their Senators, and say, "What kind of strange metamorphosis is taking place back in the old home country at the present time?"

What a tragedy if some day they come back and we must make confession as to how we failed to hold the ramparts of freedom on the home front. You see, they are coming back some day. There is going to be a great homecoming. Why, there will be a homecoming in every community, large and small, throughout this broad land. Can you not imagine it? I imagine it in terms of my own discharge from the Army a generation ago, when I telegraphed my mother from Camp Dodge, Iowa, and said, "Mother, I will be home on a certain day."

I knew what was going to happen. She was going to be there. Why, a hero was coming home. Every soldier is a hero. So heroes are coming home, many million strong. The house will be cleaned from cellar to garret. There will be a chocolate cake on the kitchen table. His girl's picture is going to be there on the little table in the front room, right alongside of the Holy Bible. His mother is going to start looking out of the kitchen window days before he ever arrives.

Then comes that day, and he is going to hop up those steps of the old home and put his arms around her, and her loving arms will encircle him as she says, "Oh, my son, you are back." "Yes, Ma, I am back." So there will be tea and there will be chocolate cake, and there will be that great homecoming when the crystal tears of the mother drop upon the shoulders of the soldier son.

Then he is going to tell where he has been. Why, he left Peoria and they sent him to a classification center. Then they sent him to San Diego or Camp Wolters or some other camp, and after a while he landed in Guadalcanal. Maybe he was in the battle at Salerno, or he was in the battle of Naples, or he was in that group that went into Berlin and Tokyo when that great day comes. He is going to give a great running recital of his accounting as a member of the armed services, of how he fought for the four freedoms. Oh, what a great homecoming that will be.

Then when that recital is all over he is going to say, "Ma, what has been happening back home while I was gone?" Maybe he was in the Army a year, 2 years, 3 years. So then he will ask for an accounting of our stewardship. What have we been doing? That is going to be the great question, and there is going to be no dodging it. You and I and all the other millions on the home front are going to have to answer that question. If we must confess in that day that we have become the victims of the bureaus, that notwithstanding the solemnity of this body and its independent part in the constitutional structure, the only thing we can do is raise our voices in protest and chop out appropriations and tie restrictions onto appropriation bills, and make a feeble and ineffectual protest, it is going to be a pretty sad accounting. So something must be done

on the home front of freedom so that there will be no frustration.

I have said so often that the most frustrated man in all history was Moses. You remember he led the children of Israel through the wilderness. Forty years he was their spiritual leader. He did everything. Remember when they came to the spring with the bitter water, and the Lord pointed out and showed Moses the tree from which to take a bough and put it in the spring that the waters might be sweet? All those things he did. And at the end of 40 years, there out yonder was the promised land. Here was this great old man, this great leader, sitting up on that little mountain looking out into the distance, because there was the lush verdure of Judah, there was the place to which he had been directing their energies for 40 years. He wanted to go there so badly, as the culmination of a great ambition.

Then the Lord spoke out of the vaults of the heavens, and what did he say? He said, "Moses, I have caused thee to see it with thine own eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither." Listen to me, Moses. It is the Lord speaking. Lift your eyes and look out yonder. There is the promised land. You have been moving out to that objective for 40 years. There it is, Moses. You cannot go there now. But no. "I have caused thee to see it with thine own eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither."

Will there be frustrations like that when the boys come back, when they have battled in all the corners of the earth for freedom? Will they come back home and lift their eyes like Ishmael of old and say, "That gracious freedom under which we had free enterprise, under which people moved along voluntarily to do the chores of government when they were called upon to do so, that freedom under which they sacrificed so willingly and so gladly, that freedom that builded here this great country, the greatest republic in all the earth, could it be that from its shores freedom should either have vanished or be badly impaired, first at the hands of Congress, charged to preserve it, second, at the hands of the Executive, charged to enforce and uphold it, and third, at the hands of the bureaucracy, that would sabotage it?"

Can we not do something about it? Let us make a little start. I filed a discharge petition yesterday on the Wolcott bill, on which we voted as a substitute or an amendment, when the price control act was before us in November 1941. I probably cannot get a hearing on my bill over in the Banking and Currency Committee. This bill has been in that committee more than 30 days. That is why I am filing a petition to discharge the committee. I am interested in one paragraph of that bill, paragraph 2 (a)—that notwithstanding any power that is conferred upon O. P. A., the right of the citizen to go into a Federal court to secure redress of his grievances shall not be denied. That is the message that America wants to hear. They have got their fighting clothes on in the country today. They want us to do something about it, but there is not going to be any legislative schedule next

week. You better go and sign petition No. 13 on the Clerk's desk and let us get going, in the interest of the people of this great Republic who still have faith in the institutions of this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the other regular orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some letters written by myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore granted, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] for 10 minutes.

ALUMINA FROM CLAY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the great hydroelectric plants in the Columbia River Basin, Bonneville and Grand Coulee, are supplying the cheapest hydroelectric power in the United States. This vast reservoir of power is now being used for the production of aluminum and the providing of other war facilities to win the war. Over one-third of our aluminum supply for airplanes is coming from this one area. In one of these plants, the Vancouver plant of the Aluminum Co. of America, there has been produced enough aluminum to build 90,064 modern fighting planes.

The Federal Government has a combined investment in Bonneville and Grand Coulee, including distribution lines and facilities, of approximately \$400,000,000. There is also invested by the Government and private investors in the Pacific Northwest electro-process plants the sum of approximately \$171,000,000.

We are now importing most of the bauxite from which aluminum is made from South America, at heavy expense, both in dollars and the use of valuable shipping facilities which should be used for other war purposes. Furthermore, this supply is subject to hazards by being cut off by enemy action, which would almost completely stop aluminum production in the United States.

There are immense deposits of aluminum-bearing clay in the Northwest adjacent to these huge electric plants. The aluminum content is not as heavy as bauxite but new processes have been developed for utilizing these clays for the production of alumina, otherwise known as aluminum oxide. Such production would provide an adequate supply of

material from within our own borders for the production of this most strategic product needed to win the war. A semi-commercial and pilot plant of 50-ton capacity for location in the Pacific Northwest was heretofore approved by the Alumina Committee of the War Production Board, the Young Coordinating Committee, the Aluminum and Magnesium Division of the War Production Board, the War Department, and a preliminary approval by the Defense Plant Corporation.

This plant would only employ approximately 150 men, who, according to official surveys made, are available in the territory immediately adjacent to the clay deposits to be developed. These men would not be taken from existing war industries but are local citizens not otherwise employed in war activities. This project has now been refused the "green light" to proceed with construction on the alleged ground that there is a manpower shortage in the Pacific Northwest area. As a matter of fact, proceeding with the construction of the plant as heretofore authorized, will not in any way interfere with war production, will not take one single man from any existing war activity, and will not take any men who are otherwise available for war industries. It is believed by all of the people of the Northwest, including the delegations in Congress of all these States, that to jeopardize the successful operation of this huge investment of the Federal Government, as well as private investors, of this great industry of the Northwest by failing to take the proper steps now to utilize the local deposits of aluminum-bearing clay, is not only unwise but will jeopardize our ability to produce the much-needed aluminum for our air forces. Furthermore, the Government is vitally interested in protecting its huge investment in this great industry and providing a source of raw material which will insure its successful operation, not only in wartime but in the post-war period which will need this most useful product—aluminum. The dwindling supply of bauxite in the United States makes it necessary to take steps at once to provide adequate supply from other sources. By utilizing local clays in the vicinity of the aluminum plants, we will save valuable railroad transportation so much needed in our war effort. It is estimated that each year 16,000 freight cars will be conserved by using Northwest aluminum instead of Eastern bauxite for aluminum making. We will also save valuable cargo space on shipping from South America to our shores, greatly in demand for other war products.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact the War Manpower Commission order on this aluminum is based on a shortage of manpower, and a survey out there will show that for the construction of this plant there are actually ample men available for employment in the construction

industry because of contracts being canceled, and there are plenty of contractors. I have checked this in my district, and the gentleman has in his. I wonder if there is anything underneath this? I wonder if we are not treading on the feet of that eastern Aluminum Trust that does not want aluminum developed on the western coast.

Mr. ANGELL. That is absolutely correct with reference to the manpower situation. I have made inquiry myself of the officials in my State, whose duty it is to know with reference to the manpower situation, and as I said in my previous remarks, only 150 men are needed to operate the plant and three or four hundred men for its construction, and they are to be found in the locality where the plant may be constructed, from groups of citizens who will not be taken from war industry, which will not interfere in the prosecution of other war industries.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And I commend the gentleman and the other members of our delegation from the Pacific Northwest. We are not concerned with where they put this plant, just so they utilize the things we have in the Northwest, whether they be in the gentleman's State or my State, or in some other State in the Northwest.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman is correct. The entire delegation is in accord with that thought.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And that we may develop the power that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has been talking about for so many years.

Mr. ANGELL. And may I say that the delegation of the three Northwestern States are agreed on that. There is no controversy as to where the particular plant shall be located. The only idea is that it be located in proximity to the hydroelectric power in the Northwest area, so that we may use the local clays without being compelled to bring bauxite from South America.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. There is a process known to manufacturers of aluminum for extracting aluminum from clay, and from 25 to 40 percent of all clay is aluminum.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Aluminum is infinitely the most abundant metal in the earth. In order to utilize that process it is necessary to have an abundant supply of cheap electric power. Today we are in this position. About 66 percent of the high-grade bauxite in the world is now in enemy country. Probably 15 or 20 percent is in South America. We have not enough high-grade bauxite in the United States to supply our demands for another year, and in order to meet the demand, we are going to have to develop and utilize this process of extracting aluminum from clay.

The Aluminum Trust has done all it could to prevent the utilization of that process, because when it is put into op-

eration it will mean the death knell of the aluminum monopoly.

I have been trying for some time to get one of these pilot plants established in the Tennessee Valley area. I am willing to join the gentleman from Oregon, who is now addressing the House, and my distinguished friend from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in their efforts to get this process put into operation along the Columbia River, because our great supply of hydroelectric power now comes from the Tennessee River and the Columbia River. By developing this process they cannot only meet our war demands, but free the American people from the clutches of the Aluminum Trust and give us an abundance of that metal for all purposes throughout all time to come.

Mr. ANGELL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, this entire subject was discussed in a very informative article by Merlin Blais, a staff writer on the Portland Oregonian, appearing in the September issue of Mining World. I include this article as a part of my remarks:

ALUMINUM—FUTURE OF INDUSTRY IN THE NORTHWEST RESTS WITH W. M. C.

(By Merlin Blais)

(Already producing nearly a third of the Nation's light metal, blessed with cheap power and alumina-bearing clays, the Pacific Northwest is fighting for the opportunity to develop a fully integrated industry after the war.)

In the Pacific Northwest aluminum has become the foremost metal industry, with an investment of \$125,000,000. Five new war plants in Washington and Oregon are spewing forth more than a half billion pounds of the fabulous light metal a year. Ten thousand men and women are advancing the war effort on the industry's pay rolls.

These five reduction plants operated by Alcoa at Vancouver, Spokane, and Troutdale, by Reynolds at Longview, and by Olin at Tacoma—are turning out fully one-third of all the pure aluminum made in the United States. Two years ago the Northwest was producing none. Today this region stands in the forefront as war ushers in a dazzling new light-metals era.

But, large as the Northwest's aluminum output now is, prospects for a permanent peacetime industry have been cloaked in doubt. Only recently have these prospects justified definite optimism. Natural resources offer an essential key to the future.

Bonneville-Grand Coulee power, cheapest electricity in the Nation, is responsible for the aluminum industry already established in this region. Power costs alone have been estimated at \$30 per ton of the metal cheaper here than in the Eastern States. This advantage will prove a potent incentive for continuing the industry at war's end.

The future may depend also upon the fortunes of a proposed \$4,000,000 alumina-from-clay plant, which, far from being built, is still in the hands of several war agencies on Capitol Hill, where it has been buffeted about among a multitude of plans to further the war output.

EDICT FORCED CANCELS PLANS FOR PLANT

More vital than it might seem, the long-sought plant would extract aluminum oxide from clay mined at Hobart Butte or Molalla in Oregon or at Castle Rock in Washington. After much delay, the clay-treating unit

gained approval by the War Production Board for critical materials. Then, with a trench mortar's impact, the War Manpower Commission more recently ditched the hard-won concession with a sweeping Northwest ban on new industries.

Oregon, Washington, and Idaho spokesmen have lifted hopes anew with a fighting comeback in which W. M. C. has been advised that the proposed aluminum oxide plant would need only 300 laborers for construction and 150 or fewer for its operation—none to be needed before well into 1944. Senators CHARLES L. McNARY, RUFUS HOLMAN, and MON C. WALLGREN, among its most potent champions on Capitol Hill, picture the latest prospects with obvious optimism.

Donald M. Nelson, war production czar, has acknowledged merits of the project in a letter to Gov. Earl Snell, of Oregon, in which he commented, "We recognize there are advantages in placing an aluminum plant in that area and are therefore hopeful of finding some location which will be able to meet the necessary construction and operational requirements."

Now, why is a new \$4,000,000 plant so important to an industry which already has a half dozen operations which cost \$125,000,000? The answer concerns all 3,500,000 residents of the Pacific Northwest, particularly as chances for its realization stand high.

Besides the huge ingot-production plants already in operation, the advocated unit would add hardly a trickle to the stream of aluminum. Its 50-tons-per-day capacity of aluminum oxide—popularly called alumina—can contribute little to satiate the ravenous, 2,000-ton daily appetite of the region's busy reduction pots.

TWO POUNDS YIELDS ONE POUND OF VITAL METAL

A 50-ton plant is not even considered a full commercial operation, but, strange as it seems, the post-war fate of the entire aluminum industry in the Pacific Northwest may hinge upon whether it is built and successfully run or not built at all. For it will utilize the Northwest's own resources—its clays, its coal and hydroelectric power, its water, and its human labor, but particularly its native clays.

Aluminum is made from aluminum oxide, or alumina. Two pounds of this white powder yields one pound of the pure metal when subjected to reduction by electricity. Richest source of alumina is bauxite ore, which contains about 60 percent. Most bauxite comes from Dutch Guiana, on South America's east coast; some is found in Arkansas and adjacent States. Alunite is another but scarcer source.

High-alumina clays contain as much as 40 percent or more, but the yield of aluminum oxide is only 30 percent or slightly less on the average. To the Northwest's aluminum industry, however, clays offer definite advantages.

Every pound of alumina now fed into the reducing pots of this region's five pig aluminum plants must make a rail journey of 2,500 to 3,000 miles from ore-treating plants in the Southeastern States. Most of the ore already has come from the Southern Hemisphere, taking much precious cargo space on freighters which might have been carrying supplies to American fighters on foreign soil.

Then more than half of the ingot or pig aluminum takes another cross-country joyride to eastern rolling mills, some of it again moving west to become bombers at Boeing's in Seattle. The new rolling mill constructed at Spokane, after a change of site from Fairview, can process about two-fifths of the Northwest's aluminum output, eliminating to that extent the wasteful round-trip haul to Eastern States.

As it operates now, the industry in Oregon and Washington has but one major advantage—its access to a vast cheap river of elec-

tricity, large blocks of which are essential. When the war's production pressures pass with the coming of peace, can this industry survive?

Metallurgists point out that, first of all, a cheaper source of aluminum oxide is practically imperative. Expanded manufacture and expanded consumer markets also are needed, but these will hark only to the call of low-price aluminum. A key to the future lies in the Northwest's own soil.

Five likely clay beds have been discovered in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. The Federal Bureau of Mines has studied all five, making its most thorough test-holing at two sites in western Oregon and one in western Washington. Findings have not been announced, but it is understood that the richest deposit is at Hobart Butte, 12 miles due south of Cottage Grove, and the largest lies a few miles southeast of Molalla. The third clay bed, also of considerable size, with an estimated 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 tons, lies along the Toutle River east of Castle Rock.

The other principal deposits are situated near Spokane and in Latah County, northern Idaho. Improbable locations for the initial experimental plant, these will figure strongly for any expansion of clay-treating facilities.

The Northwest's struggle for an alumina-from-clay industry has confronted more than its share of obstacles and final authorization of a plant, though it may not be large, will be truly a major triumph. In the metallurgical sphere the problems were: Is there a practical process for reducing clay to aluminum oxide? And, is there enough accessible clay in the region to justify an industry?

Processes have not been lacking in number and variety. Sixty of them passed through the hands of the W. P. B.'s subagency, the Office of Production Research and Development. One of these, the Hixson process, cost two eastern concerns \$20,000 to develop to the pilot-plant stage.

WET CLAY MINED AND CRUSHED BEFORE TREATMENT

Among the more likely methods named for this area are the sulfuric acid process of Kalumite, Inc., a subsidiary of the Olin Corporation which runs the Tacoma reduction unit; the ammonium bisulfate process of the Chemical Construction Company, a subsidiary of the American Cyanamid Corporation, and a modified ammonium bisulfate process developed by the United States Bureau of Mines.

The initial \$4,000,000 plant, after W. P. B. approved it and before W. M. C. shelved it, was awarded by the Defense Plant Corporation to the Columbia Metals Company and the ammonium sulfate process was to be utilized. The clay is wet when mined and must be dried and crushed before being treated. Then, in this process ammonium sulfate and clay are heated to convert the aluminum oxide in the clay to soluble aluminum sulfate. The insoluble silica is filtered off and the iron is removed.

Ammonia is used then to precipitate alumina as aluminum hydrate, which is filtered and washed, then dried in a kiln where it becomes powdery white aluminum oxide. This alumina is shipped to a reduction plant, such as those operating in Longview or Troutdale, for transformation into the pure light metal. The sulfate is recovered as ammonium sulfate and reused.

Alkalis are used to reduce bauxite ores, but acid reagents appear necessary for the alumina clays. Cost of treating the latter in commercial quantities is not known definitely, but admittedly it will be much higher than for bauxite. To begin with, more clay is needed. Four tons of bauxite will yield two tons of aluminum oxide, which in turn

can be reduced by power to one ton of aluminum. Eight to ten tons of clay will be required to produce this amount.

Clay must therefore be accessible in large quantities which can be mined at low cost. The deposits must lie close to the surface and be handy to cheap transportation. Generally, the clay must not lie beneath a surface soil overburden which is thicker than the clay stratum itself.

Does the Northwest meet this requirement? A satisfactory industry, metallurgists estimate, would need about 3,000,000 tons of clay per year. Reserves of 75,000,000 to 100,000,000 and more tons would be essential to an industry with a life span of 25 years or longer.

This is a huge quantity of clay, but mining men believe the Northwest has it. The Bureau of Mines and Geological Survey has been test drilling the principal known deposits for the past year. Its findings, not announced, were a major influence in the War Production Board's approval for a pilot plant and it is believed that the Hobart Butte, Molalla, and Castle Rock deposits together contain the minimum 75,000,000 tons, at least.

Extent of the Spokane and Latah clay deposits is not known definitely, but these might justify their own plants. Other high-alumina clay beds of unknown size exist in Oregon and Washington. In northwest Oregon, for example, the richest clay yet found is in the Macleay district, 7 or 8 miles east of Salem. Another promising deposit lies near the lower Columbia River, 6 miles west of Rainier.

What about other raw materials? Second needed resource is fuel, used for furnaces, steam generation, and kiln drying. Fuel oil is the preferred heating source. A pilot plant such as that planned for the Northwest would use an estimated 6 to 8 barrels of fuel oil per ton of aluminum oxide produced.

BONNEVILLE PLAYS IMPORTANT ROLE WITH LOW-RATE POWER

Northwest coal can be substituted for oil in some operations and hogged fuel from the area's hundreds of sawmills can also be used. Coal from Coos Bay is suggested for use at the Hobart Butte site and Oregon authorities have given assurance that this soft coal will be laid down by rail at cheap rates by the time a plant there would need it. Coal mines of the Centralia district might supply a plant located at Castle Rock.

Low-cost Bonneville power, already a boon to ingot plants and rolling mills, offers cheap motive power and also a substitute for fuel in some operations, particularly if such a plant were located at Troutdale, Canby, or Salem, and other possible sites. More than 5,000 kilowatts are the estimated requirements for the 50-ton unit.

This alumina-from-clay set-up also would need about 100,000 gallons of water per ton of output, to be used in chemical processes and in the alumina bath which precedes kiln drying. West of the Cascades, this raises no great problem except as to water rights. The amount of ammonium sulfate needed is not known definitely.

About 150 men would be employed for regular production, it is estimated. Larger plants, of course, would need proportionately fewer men. The W. M. C.'s blanket ban on new Northwest industries interrupted the clay-plant project because of its manpower requirement in the face of an apparent labor shortage in the area.

Why the W. P. B. limited the initial project to a capacity of 50 tons per day has been a question for conjecture. First application to the War Production Board sought a 200-ton plant. This was halved to 100 tons, then slashed again to 50 tons. The region's needs for alumina exceed 2,000 tons per day.

Several commercial plants producing from 200 to 500 tons daily will be necessary if the Northwest is to become independent of distant sources of aluminum oxide. A 50-ton plant would appear puny and disappointing, indeed, but W. P. B. has explained that a modest start is best so that "bugs" found in new processes might be worked out quickly and inexpensively.

The danger, however, would lie in the chance that those opposed to an alumina-from-clay industry would point to the costs of a small, semicommercial plant as evidence that cheap production is impossible on any scale.

VISIONARIES WILL BE VICTORIOUS IF W. M. C. YESSES PLANT

If the Northwest wins final approval of its first clay-treating unit, that will constitute victory of the visionary over the reactionary. Its delay in spite of the war emergency reflects the sharpness of the behind-the-scenes conflict. The most public phase saw ex-Congressman Walter M. Pierce tilting his eloquent lance repeatedly against the Aluminum Co. of America, which, before war needs prompted expansion beyond Alcoa's aegis, enjoyed a virtual monopoly in this light-metal field.

Fortune magazine, in an article of May 1943, asserted that one of the clay-treating processes was retarded by veto of a National Academy of Sciences committee, which was "heavy with big-metal-company technical men."

O. P. R. D., the article went on, displayed the stated attitude that "there is enough United States bauxite for a 4-year war and its jobs is to put a completely worked-out alumina-from-clay process on the shelf ready for the next war."

SUB CRISIS EXPOSED DEPENDENCE ON VULNERABLE IMPORTS

The shipping crisis in the Caribbean sea of some months ago, however, shocked many economic leaders into a realization of the Nation's present utter dependence on an aluminum source which is vulnerable to enemy attack. Freighter losses have not been fully announced, but Axis submarine attacks were pressed with the knowledge that the sea lane from Surinam led into the air lane over Berlin, that its traffic was essential to the Allied war effort.

The Caribbean crisis lent belated impetus to the Northwest's fight in Washington for an alumina-from-clay industry. The campaign had its beginnings in the first report on western Oregon's refractory clays, prepared by Hewitt Wilson, University of Washington engineer, and Ray C. Treasher, geologist, for the Oregon department of geology and mineral industries.

This report, published in 1938, and similar State of Washington studies then furnished the basis for persistent plugging in the Nation's Capital. Of utmost import to this struggle has been the continuous support of Bonneville's market development section, keyed by the 1939 report of the section's director, Ivan Bloch. His statement on the Northwest's industrial possibilities stressed the prospects for local clays as a source of aluminum oxide.

The Northwest's own private capital became interested. The Columbia Metals Corporation, composed mostly of Northwest businessmen, has long had its application before the Government for a clay plant. The W. P. B.-approved unit was to be operated for a time by the Chemical Construction Corporation and later taken over by Columbia Metals, it was understood.

Its leaders, Charles F. Clise, board chairman, and J. O. Gallagher, president, both of Seattle, have indicated that whether the initial plant went to a Washington or to an Oregon site made little difference to them.

When larger clay-treating plants proved feasible, they could be built in both States, and possibly Idaho as well.

With an eye to the future, the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers urges the stock-piling of critical minerals as soon as this war ends, to further preparedness for any possible prevention of a World War No. 3.

The Pacific Northwest, however, does not want merely an aluminum stock-pile industry. A full-fledged economy capable not only of creating the light metal from clay, but also of processing it and fabricating it into a multitude of articles is the region's ambition.

ENGINEERS BELIEVE PLANTS MAY BE SAVED FOR POST-WAR USE

After the war some of the federally financed plant capacity may be scrapped, but engineers believe that most of it can be saved if aluminum's possibilities for civilian use are really developed. Aluminum architecture, combination of aluminum and plastics, new alloys of great strength and lightness offer vast possibilities. Aluminum aircraft and trains are accepted. Aluminum ships and motor vehicles are considered early certainties.

Of importance also are other uses of aluminum oxide in the chemicals and abrasives industries. Before war production began, aluminum was priced at 20 cents a pound. It has dropped to 15 cents and will go lower. Skilled aluminum artisans now number in the thousands and they will want to make aluminum a life work.

Engineers, including those of Alcoa, are plotting a major role for light metals in the post-war world. In fact, C. C. Carr, Alcoa's public relations head, opined quite recently that the aluminum industry here will be permanent. He explained that the power cost in the ingot plants figured at only 2 cents a pound of metal produced.

The Pacific Northwest now boasts one-third of the Nation's aluminum reduction capacity. The three States possess a large source of the metal in their alumina clays, a domestic source which only invasion can cut off. Bonneville and Grand Coulee generate the cheapest power in the land. Ample skilled manpower will be available at war's end. A vast potential market lies across the Pacific, and the west coast itself has become the new population mecca.

If the aluminum industry is to flourish in this promised land, it must be expanded on the balanced aquarium principle. Several plants to process clay from Northwest mines, the present reduction facilities, perhaps another rolling mill at tidewater to augment the big Spokane mill, then numerous factories to turn out a multitude of articles from ice trays to truck bodies for household and highway—these would assure the Pacific Northwest a fabulous aluminum empire.

APPEALS TO THE JUDICIARY FROM DECISIONS OF THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I did not have the privilege of hearing the able address delivered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], but I did hear some of his statements relative to what I had said on this floor concerning the judiciary. The gentleman from Illinois left the impression that I was not willing to trust the judiciary of the country, and for that reason I was in favor of a special

court to pass on cases involving the Office of Price Administration.

I am willing to trust the judiciary. I have the utmost faith and confidence in that branch of our Government. I trust them collectively, as I trust the 531 Members of the House and the Senate. I trust the Congress. I know that what Congress does, generally, will be right, and if it is not right it will be corrected. But that does not mean that we would trust any individual Member of the House or Senate on any national problem or to deal with the whole of that problem. Not at all.

The judge to whom the gentleman referred, Judge Atwell of Texas, is a fine example of what might happen if you permitted any district court judge to grant an injunction and stop the operation of the Office of Price Administration law. In the first place, it would take months to decide the case, and during that time inflation would get out of control and we could not get it back under control after the case had been passed on.

Judge Atwell is a good man. He is, conscientiously, a Republican. He believes that way. Lawyers differ about their interpretations of the Constitution, and he sees the Constitution as he believes, conscientiously so. Now, we have about the same number of Federal judges that we have Members of the House and Senate. It is not the exact number, but approximately the number. Let us say that half of them are Democrats and half of them are Republicans. Somewhere among those 531 men you could find some judge who would grant an injunction against the enforcement of any part of the O. P. A. law. You would have it stymied all the time. You would never be able to enforce it. So if you believe as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] believes, you just could not believe that we should have an O. P. A. law at all. I cannot take issue with those who do not believe in price control. That is their judgment; but I think we must have it and I think it has saved this country from ruinous inflation. I think without price control we would have had unlimited expansion of the currency and credit and prices so high that only the very rich could exist. We would have had a spiral of inflation that we could not have stopped, and our dollars would not be worth 10 cents today.

Now, do not be swept off your feet by arguments that people are all making so much money on the inflation question. It is true that many of the war workers are making enormous sums of money, several times as much as they have made in their lives before; doubtless too much in some instances; but that does not mean that this great middle class in our country, the people who really built this country in time of peace, and those who furnish the manpower to save it in time of war, who work on fixed salaries or live on old-age assistance checks, dividends, interest payments, rents, and fixed incomes of that nature, are getting the benefit of those large wages. It is harmful to them instead of helpful. There are millions

who have not had their wages or salaries raised at all. Let us not forget them. Therefore it is necessary that we have some control over prices. If we were to allow judges all over the country to stop this law any time they wanted to, we might just as well repeal the law and go to no trouble at all, because it would always be stopped. This is war. Things happen too fast to allow certain things to take a normal course.

The gentleman from Illinois is so solicitous of the welfare of the judiciary. If you were to pursue his argument to its logical end, you would have to say in every case that we should have the judiciary of this country pass upon it. After all, they are not elected by the people. They are appointed. But even if they were elected, it makes no difference as far as this argument is concerned. There are certain cases where it is all right for other boards and courts to pass upon the matter. I cite as an outstanding example the Veterans' Administration. Many veterans who have shed their blood and almost given their lives in defense of this country have compensation and pension claims against their Government. Can they go to the judiciary? No. They cannot go to the judiciary. They must go to the Veterans' Administration. The Congress passed the law. If they want to appeal, can they appeal to the Federal courts? No. They cannot appeal to the Federal courts. They appeal to special boards or commissions acting as courts that are set up by this Congress. It is a case absolutely on all fours.

If you want to follow the force of his logic, you can say that Congress was entirely wrong when we voted to oust certain people from the pay rolls of the Government. A man by the name of Dodd, another man by the name of Watson—I do not recall the name of the other man—were ousted from the pay roll. We passed an amendment to an appropriation bill here putting these three employees off the pay roll entirely because we did not like what they believed and advocated.

Now, if we are to follow entirely the logic of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] why do we not follow it completely and give these men a trial, an opportunity to be heard before the Federal judges, whom the distinguished gentleman from Illinois commented on so highly. There is a place where it is perfectly proper for the Congress to assume the jurisdiction it has assumed in the case of the Office of Price Administration, in the administration of veterans' matters, and other matters of that kind.

CAUTIOUS CONGRESS

This Congress, I think, is to be commended as well as the last Congress. Never before in the history of this country has Congress been so cautious about the granting of great powers, almost unlimited powers, to the Chief Executive of our Nation. And as you will recall, every major law that has granted powers to the Chief Executive, along with these tremendous powers you will find what we may call in the language

of the street, a cut-off period. For example, the law creating the Office of Price Administration will expire next year, June 30, 1944. It will be a good time to determine whether Congress wants price control or inflation right during the political campaigns. All of these laws, containing these vast powers, will expire at a fixed date.

The majority of these laws affecting the conduct of the war, containing the tremendous powers given to the Executive, contain a cut-off period under which the law will expire at the end of the war, within 6 months after the war is over, or upon the passage of a concurrent resolution by the Congress of the United States.

No Congress has been more watchful than this Congress and the preceding Congress on that question. We have made sure that the people's rights were protected and not granted to the Executive for an unlimited period of time.

I join with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in expressing the opinion that the three branches of the Government—each one should respect the other—and I think it is very necessary that comity exist between the different branches of the Government. We should have good feeling existing between the Congress and the judiciary; we should have good feeling between the Congress and the Executive. But I think also there is something we could do in that respect. We cannot always just jump on the efforts of the President—administration—and never be willing to point out a single constructive action taken or to make a single constructive suggestion; just condemn and expect to have a very fine feeling of comity, or to expect a good feeling to exist between these two branches of the Government. I feel that sometimes we are a little bit too critical, that many times we are too ready to find fault.

May I suggest to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that I think that this country is in favor of keeping down inflation, that it is opposed to higher prices, to the extent that wages and salaries are not able to bear; that it is opposed to paying \$1.25 for a loaf of bread, the price that exists in some of the countries of the world today; that it is opposed to people paying \$400 or \$500 for a suit of clothes like the ones you and I are wearing that would cost from \$25 to \$50 here; that it is opposed to people paying from \$60 to \$90 a pound for butter, as is being paid in some countries; that it is opposed to paying \$7.50 for a half pint of milk, as is happening in some countries.

Are we for inflation or are we against inflation? If we are against inflation we have got to place the tools that are needed to whip inflation in the hands of the Chief Executive. When we have placed those tools in the hands of the Chief Executive, I think we should assume the policy of cooperation and trying to get mistakes corrected, errors corrected, and where wrongs are committed, to get them corrected, rather than trying to make a body blow or attack as is now being made upon the O. P. A. law.

ARE REPUBLICANS FOR PRICE CONTROL OR INFLATION?

I think that the efforts made by the gentleman from Illinois to try to turn the O. P. A. law over to the Federal judges in this country would be one of the worst steps that we can take at any time with respect to the inflationary move that has been made in this Congress. To my knowledge it would mean unbridled inflation, it would result in printing press money and we will reach the time, if we adopt such a program, that it will take a wheelbarrow load of printing-press money to buy just one loaf of bread. We will be met with all the troubles of inflation. If prominent leaders of the Republican party like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] continue to advocate measures that will destroy price control efforts the party cannot long escape the charge that it is the inflationary, printing-press money party. Do the other Republican leaders agree with Mr. DIRKSEN that we should destroy price control and have runaway prices? They talk more about doing things to destroy O. P. A. than they do offering constructive suggestions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, October 7, I may address the House for 20 minutes after the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MAGNUSON for 7 days, on account of special naval business.

To Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. ROGERS of California) indefinitely, on account of serious illness in family.

To Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. THOMASON) for today and balance of this week, on account of death in family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 881. An act to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that com-

mittee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for emergency maternity and infant care for wives of enlisted men in the armed forces.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes), the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, October 4, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, October 5, 1943, at 11 a. m., to begin hearings on projects being considered for inclusion in an omnibus river and harbor bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, October 6, 1943, on H. R. 2701 and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The purposes of the bill is to affirm and clarify the authority of the W. S. A. to agree to a waiver of the statute of limitations in connection with claims arising from insurance agreements in case of missing vessels, in order to provide for prompt settlement of both marine risks and war risks involved.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to limit the possibility of double or overlapping recovery on account of death or injury of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. The possibility of such overlapping recovery arises in cases of seamen who are entitled to sue under the law of the United States in case of death or injury and may also be entitled to sue under foreign law on account of the same casualty.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to exclude from consideration for the purposes of old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, services of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the

U. S. A. on foreign-flag vessels or contracted for and performed wholly outside the United States, so that the coverage for such benefits for seamen employees of the W. S. A. shall be in line with the coverage in case of similar services by seamen employed by private ship-
 ping operators.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the requisition or purchase under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, of vessels owned by American concerns through foreign subsidiaries but which are not owned by United States citizens within the terms of the Merchant Marine Act and which are not idle foreign vessels within the terms of the act of June 6, 1941—Public, 101, Seventy-seventh Congress.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is, by amending Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, to authorize the return of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less which are owned by the United States under the procedure of Public Law 44 for the return to private ownership of vessels to which the United States has title which are no longer needed in the war effort.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to expressly authorize the waiver of recovery of seamen's insurance payments by the W. S. A. particularly in cases where insurance has been paid to beneficiaries on the assumption that the missing seamen were dead, but later are found to be alive. The bill follows a similar provision with respect to recovery of benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

House Joint Resolution 158. A joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy similar to that provided for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

House Joint Resolution 161. A joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to pay cash awards for suggestions received from employees to increase efficiency or improve the functioning of the agencies.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 3334, to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

769. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of \$2,300,000 (H. Doc. No. 310); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

770. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$10,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 311); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

771. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the estimates of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

772. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

773. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943, for the Division of Venereal Diseases of the Public Health Service, "Community Facilities, Defense Public Works, Office of the Administrator, Federal Works Agency (transfer to Federal Security Agency, Public Health Service)"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

774. A letter from the Senior Deputy Administrator, Office of Lend-Lease Administration, transmitting a copy of the Bureau of the Budget form entitled "Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements" and accompanying justification material which present the personnel requirements of the Office of Lend-Lease Administration for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944, ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 716). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COSTELLO: Special Committee on Un-American Activities submits a minority report and views on Japanese War relocation centers; without amendment (Rept. No. 717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3236. A bill to provide aid to dependent children in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3309. A bill to suspend

during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3338. A bill relating to Government and other exemptions from the tax with respect to the transportation of property; without amendment (Rept. No. 720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1042. A bill for the relief of Mary T. Reedy; with amendment (Rept. No. 711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Fred A. Flanders; with amendment (Rept. No. 712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURPHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2190. A bill for the relief of Marguerite R. McElroy; with amendment (Rept. No. 713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2304. A bill for the relief of Harry Tansey; without amendment (Rept. No. 714). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2459. A bill for the relief of Carl Oplinger, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3355. A bill to define the terms "line of duty" and "willful misconduct" as used in any law or regulation administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 3356. A bill to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 3357. A bill to provide for the burial in the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the armed forces of the United States during the Second World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3358. A bill to provide for the appointment of female pilots in the Air Forces of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 3359. A bill to provide for local taxation of real estate owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DEWEY:

H. R. 3360. A bill to extend to members of the armed forces certain privileges with respect to accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3361. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to pro-

vide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence," approved September 16, 1942; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

H. R. 3362. A bill to fix the annual compensation of the Secretary of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3363. A bill extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 3364. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3365. A bill to amend the joint resolution approved May 26, 1941, entitled "Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended," and to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the sale of cotton held by or on behalf of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 3366. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint rates of freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART:

H. R. 3367. A bill to provide for the national defense and to improve the flood control of the Red River by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties near Denison in the State of Texas and within the States of Texas and Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution amending the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution removing the ceiling price on corn; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 3368. A bill for the relief of the Contracting & Sales Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3369. A bill for the relief of Harry V. Hearn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURGIN:

H. R. 3370. A bill for the relief of R. W. Crews; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 3371. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3372. A bill for the relief of Knapstein Brewing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 3373. A bill for the relief of Dewey H. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2591. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of Martin J. Ryan and 45 other persons, protesting

the current campaign of the prohibitionists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2592. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of 55 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Shelbyville, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2593. Also, petition of 202 citizens of Kirkwood, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2594. Also, petition of Lizzie M. Hutchinson and 39 citizens of Batavia, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2595. Also, petition of Mrs. P. A. Tate and 63 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2596. Also, petition of Paul C. Hartzell and 48 citizens of Greenville, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2597. Also, petition of Mary E. Bridson and 21 citizens of Riverside, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2598. Also, petition of 72 citizens of Dunkirk, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2599. Also, petition of 33 citizens of New Castle, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2600. Also, petition of Isabel Lovering and 95 citizens of Lansdale and Providence, R. I., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United

States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2601. Also, petition of 52 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2602. Also, petition of Mrs. A. B. Shepard and 66 citizens of Frankfort, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2603. Also, petition of Mrs. Gordon Conrad and 50 citizens of Kenka Park, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2604. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Ed Berger and 79 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2605. Also, petition of E. L. Mankel, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2606. Also, petition of Edward Wedel of St. Louis, Mo., and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2607. Also, petition of Dominic Streff and 49 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2608. Also, petition of the Conrad Motor Sales Co., signed by 20 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2609. Also, petition of Henry Levison, of St. Louis, and 341 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2610. Also, petition of Ben Schnetzer and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2611. Also, petition of Berlin Giles and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2612. Also, petition of John Rohrbach and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2613. Also, petition of Local No. 6, Brewers and Malters Union, signed by 80 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2614. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of sundry residents of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting

against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2615. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from Morrison and Noah Oil Operators, of Albion, Ill., urging the enactment of House bill 3203 providing for an increase in the price of crude oil; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2616. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Neva Piland and others of Foll and Ozark Counties, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2617. Also, petition of T. W. Endicott and others of Hbcomo and Howell Counties, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2618. Also, petition of Jennie E. Hovey and others of Howell County, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2619. Also, petition of Mrs. G. J. Ragain and others of Marionville and Lawrence Counties, Mo., urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2620. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of Mrs. F. Brooks and others favoring passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2621. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Leah Sterling, of Eagle Rock, Calif., and others, approving House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2622. Also, petition of Rev. E. Dow Hoffman and others, favoring passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2623. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the New England Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., relative to care of returning disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2624. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of J. A. Fisher and 21 other citizens of Weston and Buckhannon, W. Va., favoring enactment of House bill 2082, to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities

of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline, by providing for the stoppage of the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2625. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mrs. G. T. Dickinson and 49 other citizens of Salem, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2626. Also, petition signed by J. C. Gearhart and 25 other citizens of Willamina, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2627. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Rev. T. M. Gladden and 65 members of the First Methodist Church of Chester, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2628. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Garden City, Kans., favoring the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2629. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of H. J. Dickherber and 30 other citizens of St. Charles County, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2630. Also, petition of Morris Care, of Silex, Mo., and 43 other citizens of the ninth district, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2631. Also, petition of C. E. Schuchman, American Legion Post, No. 323, and 14 citizens of Wentzville, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2632. Also, petition of Joe H. Sachs, of Flinthill, Mo., and 28 citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2633. Also, petition of Becker's Service Station, Flinthill, Mo., and 41 citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2634. Also, petition of Theo. Becker, of Flinthill, Mo., and 23 citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2635. Also, petition of Victor Becker, of Flinthill, Mo., and 69 other citizens of the State of Missouri, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2636. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Sunnyside, Thorp, College Place, and Outlook, Wash., urging favorable action on House bill 2082, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2637. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, committee on York, American Civil Liberties Union, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Select Committee on Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

2638. Also, petition of the Cumberland United Baptist Association, Portland, Maine, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to liquor advertising in newspapers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2639. Also, petition of the city of Waukegan, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Lake Michigan when it is at a mean level which is deemed higher than the safe conduct of interstate commerce and navigation; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everliving God, all things wax old as doth a garment; but Thou art the same. Thy years shall not fail. Change and decay in all around we see, but Thy mercy endureth forever.

Give us the untroubled calm which illumines a faith in the final triumph of every true idea let loose in the world. May we see and know Thy word as the power of a growing seed hidden in the cleft of the rock, which presently it will split to pieces. In the light of Thy presence may we know that we live only as we love; that we are strong only as we are pure; that we succeed only as we are just and merciful and good. In this tumultuous day when the highways for Thy conquering truth are being paved even by the wrath of man, we pray not that Thou shouldst help us carry out our plans, but that we may be the willing channels for Thy redemptive purpose for all mankind. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, September 30, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAND IN UTAH TO BE RESERVED FOR ADDITION TO GOSHUTE INDIAN RESERVATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A DEPARTMENT, COMMISSION, ETC.

Letters from the Postmaster General, the Acting Director, Office of Strategic Services, and the Chairman and Administrator of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department, the Office of Strategic Services, and the United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration for the quarter ending December 31, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.